

Drainage Strategy

Proposed Development at the Former Pow Beck House Care Home, Mirehouse, Whitehaven

TVH Ltd

Ref: K38890.DS/001C

| Version | Date | Prepared By | Checked By | Approved By |
|----------|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Original | 16 January 2022 | R. Heron | C. Abram | O. Sugden |
| Α | 2 nd March 2022 | R. Heron | O. Sugden | O. Sugden |
| В | 21 st April 2022 | C. Abram | O. Sugden | O. Sugden |
| С | 12 th May 2022 | C. Abram | O. Sugden | O. Sugden |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Page | 1

Registered Office: RG Parkins & Partners Ltd, Meadowside, Shap Road, Kendal, LA9 6NY Registered in England & Wales - Company number 04107150

1. INDEMNITIES

This report is for the sole use and benefit of TVH Ltd and their professional advisors. RG Parkins & Partners Ltd will not be held responsible for any actions taken, nor decisions made, by any third party resulting from this report.

RG Parkins & Partners Ltd are not qualified to advise on contamination. Any comments contained within this report with regards to contamination are noted as guidance only and the Client should appoint a suitably qualified professional to provide informed advice. The absence of any comments regarding contamination does not represent any form of neglect, carelessness, or failure to undertake our service.

2. COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this report remains vested in RG Parkins & Partners Ltd.

All digital mapping reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data. ©Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. Licence Number 100038055

3. CONTENTS

| 1. | In | nde | mnities | 2 |
|----|------|------|--|----|
| 2. | Сс | орγ | yright | 2 |
| 3. | Сс | ont | tents | 3 |
| 4. | Ta | abl | e of Figures | 4 |
| 5. | Ta | abl | e of Tables | 4 |
| 6. | G | los | sary of Terms | 5 |
| 7. | In | ntro | oduction | 6 |
| | 7.1 | | Background | 6 |
| | 7.2 | | Planning Policy | 6 |
| | 7.3 | | The Development in the Context of Planning Policy | 6 |
| 8. | Si | ite | Characterisation | 8 |
| | 8.1 | | Site Location | 8 |
| | 8.2 | | Site Description | 8 |
| | 8.3 | | Development Proposals | 9 |
| | 8.4 | | Geology & Hydrogeology | 9 |
| | 8.5 | | Existing Drainage and Sewers | 9 |
| | 8.6 | | Hydrology | 10 |
| 9. | As | sse | essment of Flood Risk | 12 |
| | 9.1 | | Background | 12 |
| | 9.2 | | Flood Risk Terminology | 12 |
| | 9.3 | | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment | 13 |
| | 9.4 | | Fluvial Flood Risk | 13 |
| | 9.5 | | Surface Water Flood Risk | 14 |
| | 9.6 | | Groundwater Flood Risk | 16 |
| | 9.7 | | Flooding from Reservoirs, Canals or Other Artificial Sources | 16 |
| | 9.8 | | Flooding from Sewers | 16 |
| 1(|). | Su | urface Water Drainage Strategy | 17 |
| | 10.1 | L | Introduction | 17 |
| | 10.2 | 2 | Site Areas | 17 |
| | 10.3 | 3 | Surface Water Drainage Design Parameters | 18 |
| | 10.3 | 3.1 | Climate Change | 18 |
| | 10.3 | 3.2 | Percentage Impermeability (PIMP) | 19 |
| | 10.3 | 3.3 | Volumetric Runoff Coefficient, Cv | 19 |
| | 10.3 | 3.4 | Rainfall Model | 19 |
| | 10.4 | 1 | Rate of Runoff Assessment | 19 |
| | 10.5 | 5 | Surface Water Disposal | 20 |

| 10.6 | Surface Water Drainage Design |
|----------|--|
| 10.7 | Flow Control |
| 10.8 | Storage Volume |
| 10.9 | Designing for Local Drainage System Failure 21 |
| 10.10 | Surface Water Quality 22 |
| 10.11 | Maintenance 22 |
| 11. E | xisting Sewers and Watercourse |
| 11.1 | Pow Beck |
| 11.2 | Existing Foul Sewers |
| 12. F | oul Water Drainage Strategy 24 |
| 13. C | onclusions and Recommendations 25 |
| 14. R | eferences |
| Appendix | < A 27 |
| Appendix | < B 28 |
| Appendi | < C 29 |

4. TABLE OF FIGURES

| Figure 7.1 Vulnerability Clarification | 7 |
|--|----|
| Figure 8.1 Site Location | 8 |
| Figure 8.2 Pow Beck Surface Water Catchment | 10 |
| Figure 9.1 Copeland District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Map | 13 |
| Figure 9.2 Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning | 14 |
| Figure 9.3 Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Map | 15 |

5. TABLE OF TABLES

| Table 8.1 Site Geological Summary | .9 |
|---|----|
| Table 9.1 Flood Return Periods & Exceedance Probabilities. 2 | 12 |
| Table 10.1 Land Cover Areas | 17 |
| Table 10.2 Area of Potentially Impermeable & Permeable Land Cover | 18 |
| Table 10.3 Area of Existing Impermeable & Permeable Land Cover | 18 |
| Table 10.4 Peak Rainfall Intensity Allowance in Small and Urban Catchments | 18 |
| Table 10.5 Calculated Greenfield Rate of Runoff from Proposed Impermeable Areas | 19 |
| Table 10.6 Pollution Hazard & Mitigation Indices – Parking | 22 |
| Table 10.7 Pollution Hazard & Mitigation Indices – Access Road | 22 |
| Table 12.1 Foul Runoff Results | 24 |

6. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

| AEP | Annual Exceedance Probability |
|------|------------------------------------|
| AOD | Above Ordnance Datum |
| BGL | Below Ground Level |
| BGS | British Geological Society |
| СС | Climate Change |
| СВС | Copeland Borough Council |
| EA | Environment Agency |
| FEH | Flood Estimation Handbook |
| LLFA | Lead Local Flood Authority |
| NPPF | National Planning Policy Framework |
| OS | Ordnance Survey |
| RGP | RG Parkins & Partners Ltd |
| SuDS | Sustainable Drainage System |
| UU | United Utilities |

7. INTRODUCTION

7.1 BACKGROUND

This report has been prepared by R. G. Parkins & Partners Ltd (RGP) for TVH Ltd. in support of proposals for the redevelopment of the site of the former Pow Beck House care home, Mirehouse, Whitehaven.

RGP has been appointed to identify a Drainage Strategy in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to support a planning application that fulfils the requirements of the Local Planning Authority and the Sewerage Undertaker.

Due to the proposed floor space exceeding an area greater than 1,000 m², the development is classed as major development in accordance with The Town and Country Planning Order 2015^[1]

7.2 PLANNING POLICY

The NPPF^[1] and its Planning Practice Guidance^[2] states "a site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in Flood Zones 2 and 3. In Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in the future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use." As part of this assessment drainage details are required to prove the development can be drained in a sustainable manner without increasing flood risk to property downstream.

7.3 THE DEVELOPMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF PLANNING POLICY

The area covered by the application is 0.31 ha (hectares) and by reference to the Environment Agency Flood Map, the site lies in Flood Zone 1.

Table 2 of the NPPF's Planning Practice Guidance ^[2] classifies each development into a vulnerability class, depending on the type of development, as outlined in Table 7.1. The site is to be developed for a residential care home; and is classified as 'more vulnerable'. 'More Vulnerable' development classes are deemed acceptable in terms of flood risk within Flood Zones 1 and 2 but require an exception test for development within Flood Zone 3a.

Figure 7.1 Vulnerability Clarification

| Vulnerability Classification | Development |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Essential Infrastructure | Essential transport infrastructure (including mass evacuation routes) which has to cross the area at risk. Essential utility infrastructure, which has to be located in a flood risk area for operational reasons, including electricity generating power stations and grid and primary substations; and water treatment works that need to remain operational in times of flood. Wind turbines. |
| Highly Vulnerable | Police and ambulance stations; fire stations and command centres; telecommunications installations required to be operation during flooding. Emergency dispersal points. Basement dwellings. Caravans, mobile homes, and park homes intended for permanent residential use. Installations requiring hazardous substances consent. |
| More Vulnerable | Hospitals. Residential institutions such as residential care homes, children's homes, prisons and hostels. Buildings used for dwelling houses, student halls of residence, drinking establishments, nightclubs, and hotels. Non-residential uses for health services, nurseries, and education establishments. Landfill and sites used for waste management facilities for hazardous waste. Sites used for holiday or short let caravans and camping, subject to a specific warning and evacuation plan |
| Less Vulnerable | Police, ambulance, and fire stations which are NOT required to be operational during flooding. Buildings used for shops; financial, professional, and other services; restaurants, cafes and hot food takeaways; offices; general industry, storage and distributions; non-residential institutions not included in the 'more vulnerable' class; and assemble and leisure. Land and buildings used for agriculture and forestry. Waste treatment (except landfill & hazardous waste facilities). Minerals working & processing (except for sand & gravel working). Water treatment works which do not need to remain operational during times of flood. Sewage treatment works, if adequate measures to control pollution and manage sewage during flooding events are in place. |
| Water- Compatible Development | Flood control infrastructure. Water transmission infrastructure & pumping stations. Sewage transmission infrastructure & pumping stations. Sand & gravel working. Docks, marinas, and wharves. Navigation facilities. Ministry of Defence installations. Ship building, repairing & dismantling, dockside fish processing & refrigeration & compatible activities requiring a waterside location. Water based recreation (excluding sleeping accommodation). Lifeguard and coastguard stations. Amenity open space, nature conservation & biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms. Essential ancillary sleeping or residential accommodation for staff required by uses in this category subject to a specific warning & evacuation plan. |

8. SITE CHARACTERISATION

8.1 SITE LOCATION

The proposed site is located on Meadow Road in Mirehouse which is on the south side of Whitehaven in West Cumbria at National Grid Co-Ordinates 298396E 515494N. The site's location is shown in Figure 8.1.



Figure 8.1 Site Location

8.2 SITE DESCRIPTION

The site consists of a former 38-bed care facility with off-street parking (14 spaces) which has been closed since 2019. There are some green areas in the centre and around the periphery of the buildings. The site was formerly owned and operated by the Copeland Borough Council. The site has a very gentle slope from north east to south west, with site levels ranging from 26.67m AOD on the north eastern boundary to 24.00m AOD upon the south western boundary of the site, as shown on the topographical survey.

8.3 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

It is proposed to demolish an existing two-storey building, formerly known as Pow Beck care home and to erect a new care home comprising 36 one- and two-bedroom flats over three storeys.

8.4 GEOLOGY & HYDROGEOLOGY

British Geological Survey (BGS)^[2] and Land Information Systems (LandIS)^[3] mapping indicates the site is underlain by the geological sequences outlined in Table 8.1. The solid geology is classed as a Secondary A aquifer and the superficial geology is a Secondary (undifferentiated) aquifer^[4]. The EA Groundwater Vulnerability Map^[4] indicates that the underlying aquifers have a low to medium vulnerability.

| Geological Unit | Classification | Description | Aquifer Classification |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| Soil | Soilscape 6 | Freely draining slightly acid loamy soils | N/A |
| Drift | Till, Devensian – Diamicton Alluvium - Clay, Silt, Sand and Gravel | Typically, a clay-dominated material with frequent rounded stones. Clay, silt, sand and gravel | Summary: Secondary Undifferentiated |
| Solid | Pennine Lower Coal Measures Formation - Mudstone, Siltstone and Sandstone | Interbedded grey mudstone, siltstone and pale grey sandstone, commonly with mudstones containing marine fossils in the lower part, and more numerous and thicker coal seams in the upper part. | Summary: Secondary A |

Table 8.1 Site Geological Summary

8.5 EXISTING DRAINAGE AND SEWERS

Reference to the UU sewer records and the drainage layout plan provided by Copeland Borough Council (CBC) shows 2 no. foul sewers and a surface water sewer crossing the eastern side of the site. The surface water sewer is a culverted watercourse, Pow Beck, which crosses beneath the eastern extent of the existing building. The records are provided in Appendix B for reference.

The surface water sewer has a diameter of 600mm as it crosses the site, increasing to a 1350mm dia. prior to the watercourse becoming an open channel at the rear of Seathwaite Avenue, c. 560m north west of the proposed development site.

Part of the existing surface water sewer passing through the site was investigated by SK Drainage Solutions Ltd in August 2021. The overall finding was that some sections of the 600mm culvert have defects which can be repaired without the need to excavate.

A more recent drainage survey was carried out by Drain Doctor on 18th January 2022. This investigation examined the surface water sewer (although not CCTV surveyed) and the two foul sewers that run under the site. The survey confirmed that the surface water sewer has a diameter of 600 mm and passes beneath part of the existing building.

The Drain Doctor survey also confirmed the presence of 2no. 225mm dia. foul sewers in the east of the site. These 2 pipes converge within a single manhole within the site boundary, flows then discharge into a single 225 dia. pipe downstream. Upon passing through the rear garden of No. 5 Link Road, the pipe is upsized to a 375mm dia. increasing to a 1200mm dia. foul sewer once within Link Road.

8.6 HYDROLOGY

The closest open channel surface water feature is Pow Beck which flows in a northerly direction, approximately 540m north west of the site. This watercourse flows northwards through Whitehaven and discharges into Whitehaven Harbour, its catchment is shown in Figure 8.2.

The watercourse is culverted beneath parts of Whitehaven, including parts of Mirehouse. At the point it passes through the proposed development site, the culvert is classed as an 'Ordinary Watercourse', and as such is maintained by the LLFA. It becomes a 'Main River' c. 200 m north west of the site. There are no surface water features within or adjacent to the site but there is an ephemeral pond approximately 40 m south of the site.



Figure 8.2 Pow Beck Surface Water Catchment

Figure 8.2 is based on FEH Catchment Descriptors, correspondence with Copeland BC's drainage engineer has identified this to be inaccurate, there are in fact numerous sub catchments within the overall catchment shown in Figure 8.2, as it is known the south west section drains to Pow Beck flowing towards St. Bees. Further anomalies within the catchment have also been identified but are not relevant for this planning application.

9. ASSESSMENT OF FLOOD RISK

9.1 BACKGROUND

The following risk assessment has been carried out in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework^[5] and its Planning Practice Guidance^[6] on Flood Risk. The broad aim of the guidance is to reduce the number of people and properties within the natural and built environment at risk of flooding. To achieve this aim, planning authorities are required to ensure that flood risk is properly assessed during the initial planning stages.

Responsibility for this assessment lies with the developers and they must demonstrate:

- Whether the proposed development is likely to be affected by flooding.
- Whether the proposed development will increase flood risk in other parts of the hydrological catchment.
- That the measures proposed to deal with any flood risk are sustainable.

The developer must prove to the Local Planning Authority and the Environment Agency that the existing flood risk or the flood risk associated with the proposed development can be satisfactorily managed.

9.2 FLOOD RISK TERMINOLOGY

Flood risk considers both the probability and consequence of flooding.

Flood events are often described in terms of their probability of recurrence or probability of occurring in any one year. The threshold between a medium flood and a large flood is often regarded as the 1 in 100-year event. This is an event which statistical analysis suggests will occur on average once every hundred years. However, this does not mean that such an event will not occur more than once every hundred years. Table 9.1 shows the event return periods expressed in years and annual exceedance probabilities as a fraction and a percentage.

For example, a 1 in 100-year event has a 1% probability of occurring in any one year, i.e. a 1 in 100 probability. A 1000-year event has a 0.1% probability of occurring in any one year, i.e. a 1 in 1000 probability.

| Return Period | Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--|
| (years) | Fraction | Percentage | |
| 2 | 0.5 | 50% | |
| 10 | 0.1 | 10% | |
| 25 | 0.04 | 4% | |
| 50 | 0.02 | 2% | |
| 100 | 0.01 | 1% | |
| 200 | 0.005 | 0.5% | |
| 500 | 0.002 | 0.2% | |
| 1000 | 0.001 | 0.1% | |

Table 9.1 Flood Return Periods & Exceedance Probabilities.

9.3 STRATEGIC FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT

Copeland Borough Council (CBC) has carried out a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for their area^[7]. The SFRA identifies Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b. Figure 9.1 shows an extract from the CBC SFRA. This shows that the site is not in any of the identified flood zones. The nearest flood zone is on the opposite side of the nearby rail line, and this is Flood Zone 2. The map also identifies a localised drainage issue in Croasdale Avenue on the opposite side of the railway line from the site.



Figure 9.1 Copeland District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Map

9.4 FLUVIAL FLOOD RISK

Figure 9.2 shows the flood zones identified by the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning^[8]. This map identifies the extents of Flood Zones 2 and 3 but it does not subdivide Zone 3 into 3a and 3b. The map shows that the site is located within Flood Zone 1.



Figure 9.2 Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning

9.5 SURFACE WATER FLOOD RISK

Surface water flooding is that which results from extreme rainfall rather than overflowing rivers. This type of flooding typically occurs when extreme rainfall causes water to run down slopes and collect in depressions in the landscape or where runoff is focussed into an area where drainage is insufficient. It can also cause erosion and deposition resulting in the partial or complete blockage of drains or culverts as well as damage to other infrastructure and property.

Figure 9.3 shows an extract from the EA surface water flood risk map^[9]. This has four risk classifications from very low probability (<0.1% AEP) to high probability (>3.3% AEP). The EA's map shows that surface water flooding can occur around the site. Reference to the topographic survey in the area of the former care home entrance shows levels dip from the east and west, causing surface water to pond. It also appears there is a flow route from St. Andrews Church, adding to this area of ponding.

The surface water mapping product is a crude representation of possible pluvial flood risk due to omission of drainage systems and broad assumptions regarding conveyance.

As the existing building will be demolished, the new proposals will incorporate levelling/ regarding of the topography, the surface water map does therefore not provide an accurate model of the post development situation. Permeable paving is proposed which would convey surface water via the drainage system to the watercourse. A high level overflow will ensure this flow would not resurface from site drainage. Further detail is provided within the drainage strategy for the site.

Therefore, with appropriate consideration to the design of the surface water drainage system and site layout, it is considered that the risk to the site from this area of surface water flooding can be satisfactorily managed.



Figure 9.3 Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Map

9.6 GROUNDWATER FLOOD RISK

Groundwater flooding occurs when water levels in the ground rise above the ground surface. It is most likely to occur in low lying areas underlain by the more permeable rock types such as chalk and limestone and superficial deposits such as sand and gravel.

The geology at the site is mudstone, siltstone and sandstone overlain by glacial till and some alluvium. The topography of the site is relatively low-lying position within a shallow valley. The site is also close to the divide between the Woodhouse and Hensingham parts of Whitehaven. This combination of topography and sedimentary geology suggests a risk of groundwater flooding, but this is likely to be mitigated by the urban location and the likely well-developed urban drainage.

9.7 FLOODING FROM RESERVOIRS, CANALS OR OTHER ARTIFICIAL SOURCES

There is a small former reservoir approximately 550 m south-west of the site, now known as Mirehouse Ponds. The ponds appear to have been dammed at its northern end, with the dam wall appearing to be relatively low in height. If this was to fail or leak, the position of the wall relative to the topography suggests the water would flow to the south towards St Bees rather than to the north towards Whitehaven. It is known that two watercourses combine and form Seldom Seen Beck, which originally was the origin of Pow Beck to Whitehaven but was diverted into Mirehouse ponds.

The risk of flooding from this reservoir is not shown on the Environment Agency's flood risk map of reservoir flooding, probably because the reservoir volume is not high enough to qualify.

9.8 FLOODING FROM SEWERS

As illustrated by previous and recent drainage surveys, there is one surface water sewer and two foul sewers crossing the site. It is understood that sewer flooding has occurred off the site as a result of discharge from the foul sewers that run under the site. Examination of the foul sewers suggests that one of these sewers has previously been re-engineered to attenuate flow using a combination of large diameter inflow pipes, smaller diameter outflow pipes and large chambers to store flow. It is not known if this was successful or whether this sewer flooding still occurs.

10. SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE STRATEGY

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The principal aim of the following drainage strategy is to design the development to avoid, reduce and delay the discharge of rainfall to public sewers and watercourses in order to protect watercourses and reduce the risk of localised flooding, pollution and other environmental damage.

In order to satisfy these criteria, this surface water runoff assessment and drainage design has been undertaken in accordance with the following reports and guidance documents:

- SuDS Manual, CIRIA Report C753, 2015^[10].
- Code of Practice for Surface Water Management, BS8582:2013, November 2013^[11].
- Rainfall Runoff Management for Developments, Defra/EA, SC030219^[12].
- Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage Good Practice, CIRIA Report C635, 2006^[13].
- Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH)^[14].
- Flood Studies Report (FSR), Volume 1, Hydrological Studies, 1975. Institute of Hydrology^[15].
- Flood Studies Supplementary Report No 14 (FSSR14), Review of Regional Growth Curves, 1983^[16].
- Flood Estimation for Small Catchments, Marshall & Bayliss, Institute of Hydrology, Report No. 124 (IoH 124), 1994^[17].
- Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, Defra, March 2015^[18].

The following assessment and drainage strategy are based on the latest site layout plan by Stainforth Architects. Any alterations to the site plan resulting in changes in impermeable areas will require the drainage strategy to be revisited.

10.2 SITE AREAS

To support the exploration of options for site drainage, the spatial extent of different types of proposed land cover on the site have been measured. Table 10.1 shows the measured proposed land cover areas. The highest percentage roof areas covering 41% of the total site area. Paved areas cover 30%, green and landscaped areas 19% and parking/driveway 9%.

| Land Cover | Area | | Percentage of total |
|-----------------------------|------|-------|---------------------|
| | m² | На | site area |
| Total Roof Area | 1287 | 0.129 | 41% |
| Total Paved Area | 945 | 0.095 | 30% |
| Total Parking / Driveway | 275 | 0.027 | 9% |
| Garden and Landscaped Areas | 598 | 0.060 | 19% |

Table 10.1 Land Cover Areas

The site can be subdivided into land cover that could be permeable and that which could be impermeable. Potential impermeable areas are regarded as roofs, parking, roads, driveways and walkways. All other areas (principally public open space) are regarded as having a permeable surface. Table 10.2 gives the areas of potentially permeable and impermeable land cover, and this shows that impermeable areas could cover 81% of the site and permeable areas 19%.

| Land Cover | Area | | Percentage of total |
|--------------------------|------|-------|---------------------|
| | m² | На | site area |
| Total Impermeable Area | 2506 | 0.251 | 81% |
| Remaining Permeable Area | 598 | 0.060 | 19% |

Table 10.2 Area of Potentially Impermeable & Permeable Land Cover

The existing site is the home of a former care home, which is now vacant and in a dilapidated state. The site is classed as brownfield, with the existing impermeable and permeable land cover directly comparable to determine the impact of the redevelopment. Table 10.3 shows that the proposed redevelopment of the site shows a like for like replacement.

| Land Cover | Ar | Percentage of total | | | |
|--------------------------|------|---------------------|-----------|--|--|
| | m² | На | site area | | |
| Total Impermeable Area | 2492 | 0.249 | 80% | | |
| Remaining Permeable Area | 612 | 0.061 | 20% | | |

Table 10.3 Area of Existing Impermeable & Permeable Land Cover

10.3 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE DESIGN PARAMETERS

The surface water drainage system has been designed on the following basis using the modified rational method and FEH 2013 rainfall profiles.

10.3.1 CLIMATE CHANGE

Projections of future climate change indicate that more frequent, short-duration, high intensity rainfall and more frequent periods of long duration rainfall are likely to occur over the next few decades in the UK. These future changes will have implications for river flooding and for local flash flooding. These factors will lead to increased and new risks of flooding within the lifetime of the planned developments. Therefore, a factor for climate change is included in the calculations.

Current Environment Agency guidance on peak rainfall intensity climate change allowance provides two figures for climate change uplift, a Central and an Upper End estimation as outlined in Table 10.4.

Table 10.4 Peak Rainfall Intensity Allowance in Small and Urban Catchments

| Applies across all of England | Total potential change anticipated for the '2020s' (2015 to 2039) | Total potential change anticipated for the '2050s' (2040 to 2069) | Total potential change anticipated for the '2080s' (2070 to 2115) |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Upper End | 10% | 20% | 40% |
| Central | 5% | 10% | 20% |

A climate change allowance of 40% has been selected for the purpose of drainage design based on the 100-year anticipated design life of the proposed development. This figure has been selected for conservative design.

10.3.2 PERCENTAGE IMPERMEABILITY (PIMP)

The percentage impermeability (PIMP) for all impermeable areas is modelled as 100%. The entirety of the impermeable areas is to be positively drained.

10.3.3 VOLUMETRIC RUNOFF COEFFICIENT, CV

The volumetric runoff coefficient describes the volume of surface water which runs off an impermeable surface following losses due to infiltration, depression storage, initial wetting and evaporation. The coefficient is dimensionless. Default industry standard volumetric runoff coefficients are 0.75 for summer and 0.84 for winter and are used for design.

10.3.4 RAINFALL MODEL

The calculations use the REFH2 unit hydrograph methodology in line with best practice as outlined in the SuDS Manual^[10]. The calculations use the most up to date available catchment descriptors (2013) provided by the Centre for ecology and Hydrology Flood Estimation Handbook web service.

10.4 RATE OF RUNOFF ASSESSMENT

As the site area is less than 200 ha (0.3104ha), the Greenfield runoff calculations have been undertaken in accordance with the methodology described in IoH 124^[17]. For catchments of less than 50 ha, the greenfield runoff rate is scaled according to the size of the catchment in relation to a 50-ha site.

Based on the anticipated design life of the proposed development (100 years), an increase in peak runoff at 40% has been used in the calculations for the post development rate of runoff to account for climate change. Peak runoff rates have been calculated for: (i) the site as 100% Greenfield (ii) the current site as 100% Brownfield, and (iii) the future site divided into c. 2505 m² of hardstanding and roof area, and approximately 600 m² of greenfield space.

Full details of the calculations and the methodology for deriving the Peak Rate of Runoff are in included in Appendix C. A summary of the results is included in Table 10.5.

| Rate of Run-off (I/s) | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------------|--|--|
| Event | Greenfield | Brownfield | Post-Development | | |
| Q1 | 1.8 | 19.4 | 19.5 | | |
| QBAR | 2.1 | 28.1 | 28.3 | | |
| Q10 | 2.9 | 38.5 | 38.7 | | |
| Q30 | 3.6 | 46.9 | 47.2 | | |
| Q100 | 4.4 | 59.8 | 60.2 | | |
| Q100 + 40% CC | 6.1 | 83.8 | 84.3 | | |

Table 10.5 Calculated Greenfield Rate of Runoff from Proposed Impermeable Areas

10.5 SURFACE WATER DISPOSAL

Surface water disposal has been considered in line with the hierarchy outlined in the SuDS Manual^[10]. The approach considers infiltration drainage in preference to disposal to watercourse, in preference to discharge to sewer.

Permeability testing has not been carried out because the site is low lying relative to surrounding land and is therefore likely to have shallow groundwater that would impede drainage. The level of the watercourse within the site will prevent the siting of soakaways 1m above the winter groundwater level. In additional the site is presently c. 80% impermeable, providing little opportunity for testing.

Space limitations also mean that soakaways are not viable at the site. It is not possible to achieve 5m from both the buildings proposed foundations and surrounding highways, in accordance with Building Regulations Document H.

In addition, the presence of a readily available culverted watercourse within the site offers a suitable route for surface water drainage at an attenuated rate.

10.6 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE DESIGN

The proposed replacement care home and hardstanding areas will utilise the existing drainage network within the site, discharging to the 600mm dia. surface water culvert. Surface water runoff will be attenuated within 2 no. geocellular attenuation tanks, at the front and rear of the proposed property, before discharge to the culvert. Silt traps will be located upstream of each inlet, which will provide surface water treatment and access for maintenance. Silt traps isolate silt and other particles by encouraging settlement into removal silt buckets, preventing ingress into the tanks. The attenuation tanks will be founded at a suitable level, providing a minimum depth of cover of 600mm.

It is recommended that all hardstanding areas (access road, parking and paved areas) are constructed of Type B (partial infiltration) permeable block paving, incorporating a series of perforated pipes located at the base of the coarse graded aggregate, which will ultimately discharge into the geocellular attenuation tanks. The permeable block paving will act as a SuDS source control technique and provide treatment for small oil spills associated with parked vehicles.

It is proposed that all flat roofs on the care home will be constructed using Sedum roofing (green roof) product. Such roofs have reduced surface water runoff; however, all roof areas will be included within the drainage design for conservative design. The sedum roof will help support habitats for wildlife, while also helping to improve overall air quality, and boosting thermal performance of the building.

For further detail, refer to the Drainage Layout Plan (K38890-100), included in Appendix A.

10.7 FLOW CONTROL

Hydrobrake flow controls, or similar approved will restrict flows to a combined discharge of 2.1l/s to match the Greenfield Qbar. This rate will be split between the 2 no. attenuation tanks, 1.6 l/s for the tank in the north, and 0.5 l/s for the tank to the south. This combined rate will provide significant betterment on the existing Brownfield site.

10.8 STORAGE VOLUME

The drainage has been sized to attenuate runoff during a Q100 event, plus a 40% allowance for future climate change across the design life of the development (100 years). The storage estimate has been undertaken using Causeway Flow^[19], with FEH point descriptors used to model the rainfall and determine the volume of attenuation required.

The combined storage volume between the 2 no. attenuation tanks is 171 m^3 . The attenuation crate at the top of the site, within the access road provides c. 80 m³, and the tank at the rear, 91 m³.

Additional storage will be provided within the permeable paving sub base, which has not been included as part of the overall design, equating to conservative design.

10.9 DESIGNING FOR LOCAL DRAINAGE SYSTEM FAILURE

In accordance with the general principles discussed in CIRIA Report C635 – Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage^[13], the proposed surface water drainage, where practical, should be designed to ensure there is no increased risk of flooding to the buildings on the site or elsewhere as a result of extreme rainfall, lack of maintenance, blockages or other causes.

• Blockage & Exceedance

The site drainage will be designed to attenuate a 100-year design storm including a 40% allowance for climate change. The drainage system will also provide capacity for lower probability (greater design storm) events which are not of critical duration.

In the unlikely case of blockage in the geocellular tanks, associated silt traps, and/or flow control chambers, exceedance flows will remain within the paved areas/access road, with additional storage within the sub base. Perforated pipes will discharge exceedance flows back into the attenuation tanks, once the water level has subsided. The sub base storage has not been accounted for in the design, therefore the design is highly conservative.

Exceedance flows shall be retained on-site within the drainage system as far as practical.

Additional Measures

The following general measures will be implemented as part of the detailed drainage design:

Surface Storage & External Levels – the access road and parking areas should be designed to offer additional storage volume and conveyance of flood water should the attenuation system fail, flood or exceed capacity.

Overland Flow Route – The overland flow routes in the highly unlikely event of exceedance of storage would be away from the site taking the site topography into consideration. A high level overflow on the Hydrobrake should prevent any spills from the chamber during exceedance events, however, were it to overtop, then the additional storage provided within the permeable paving sub base would be utilised.

Drainage Contingency – the proposed surface water system will be designed to provide adequate storage against flooding including a 40% allowance to account for climate change.

10.10 SURFACE WATER QUALITY

The treatment of surface water is not a statutory requirement. Water quality remains a material consideration but there are no prescriptive standards to be imposed in terms of treatment train management. In the absence of a design standard, the SuDS manual has been used which outlines best practice.

Pollutants such as suspended solids, heavy metals and organic pollutants may be present in surface water runoff, the quantity and composition of the runoff is highly dependent on-site use.

The SuDS Manual^[10] outlines best practice with regards to the treatment of surface water by SuDS components prior to discharge to the environment. SuDS components can be effective in reducing the number of pollutants within the surface water discharged and therefore environmental impact of the development. SuDS components may be installed in series to form a treatment train to treat the runoff.

The simple index approach as outlined in the SuDS manual has been used to assess the pollution hazard indices and proposed treatment components, the calculations are included in Appendix C. For the categories of runoff areas served by the drainage system, residential parking and access road, treatment is proposed by permeable surfacing. Tables 10.6 and 10.7 summarise the pollution hazard and mitigation indices for this type of runoff.

| Indices | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydrocarbons |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| Pollution Hazard | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Pollution Mitigation | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Treatment Suitability | Adequate | Adequate | Adequate |

Table 10.6 Pollution Hazard & Mitigation Indices – Parking

Table 10.7 Pollution Hazard & Mitigation Indices – Access Road

| Indices | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydrocarbons |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| Pollution Hazard | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Pollution Mitigation | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Treatment Suitability | Adequate | Adequate | Adequate |

10.11 MAINTENANCE

The drainage will remain private and will therefore be maintained by the site owners. A SuDS Operations & Maintenance Plan has been made available (K38890-02) to the site owners detailing the requirements for future maintenance of the drainage system.

11. EXISTING SEWERS AND WATERCOURSE

11.1 POW BECK

It is proposed that Pow Beck will remain on its original line under the building, as suggested by the LLFA. The survey of the culvert undertaken by SK Drainage Solutions Ltd in August 2021 noted there was cracking within the section that passes under the existing building. Whilst this section is likely to be repairable, the proposed layout places the new building over the current access manholes. As part of the works, this section of culvert will therefore be replaced, with the two existing manholes relocated upstream and downstream of the extent of the build over. The alignment of the watercourse will be retained. Over-pumping of the watercourse is likely to be the preferred option for management of flow and this work should be undertaken during low flow.

A build over agreement would be subject to approval from the LLFA and Building Control, prior to commencement on site, with the build over totalling 17.4 m. A watercourse consent application shall be submitted to the LLFA with method statements detailing the approach to construction.

11.2 EXISTING FOUL SEWERS

A 6-metre easement on the alignment of the existing sewer cannot be accommodated due to the layout constraints nor is there sufficient room to allow for a sewer diversion including an easement. Level information provided on the UU records also indicates that if the length of the sewer were to be increased it would appear that there would be inadequate scope to prove sufficient gradients to allow for disposal via. conventional gravity methods and a sewer diversion is therefore not considered a viable solution in any case. Previous correspondence with United Utilities indicated that a build over agreement would be required in these circumstances.

The CCTV survey undertaken by Drain Doctor in January 2022 confirmed that there are 2 no. 225mm diameter public foul sewers that pass under the proposed buildings outline, and these will require build over agreements (incorporating a sewer diversion for new manholes) with UU. As some of the existing manholes are located under the new building footprint, these foul runs will need to be extended and the manholes replaced and relocated outside of the building footprint for access. This will also require a formal sewer diversion agreement with UU.

To reduce the extent of build over agreement, it may be possible and more practical to combine the 2 no. foul runs into a single pipe upstream of the proposed building. This will result in only one public sewer passing below the building. This would require approval from UU and further investigations would be required to verify the relative invert levels of the existing sewers at this location. This will need to be progressed following planning approval.

12. FOUL WATER DRAINAGE STRATEGY

The existing site contains connections to the existing 225mm diameter public combined sewer that passes below the building. The CCTV drainage survey also confirmed the presence of an existing outfall from the south of the site with discharge to a 225 dia. foul sewer in Link Road. It is proposed that this existing connection is retained. Foul drainage shall reuse these connections where site conditions allow. Indicative routing and level information of the proposed private foul drainage has been included on Drawing No. K38890- 100B for reference.

Following correspondence with UU regarding the proposals it was requested that non-return valves are to be fitted to all proposed private foul connections. Two non return valves are proposed at each proposed connection point as indicated on drawing No. K38890-100B included in Appendix A.

Preliminary foul water discharge calculations have been undertaken in accordance with British Water Code of Practice Flow and Loads 4, see Table 12.1^[20]. The estimated predicted peak foul water flow rate from the development is 0.297 l/s.

| Source of Waste | | | | | Flow (L/day) | |
|--|---------------|--------------------|----|-------------|--------------|--|
| Description | No of Type | Occupancy /unit | Р | Per Head | Total | |
| Residential Care Home- British Water Flows and Loads | | | | | | |
| Residential old people / nursing – 1bed | 18 | 2 | 36 | 350 | 12,600 | |
| Residential old people / nursing – 2bed | 9 | 4 | 36 | 350 | 12,600 | |
| Day Staff (including mid-day meal)15590 | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | 25,650 | |

Table 12.1 Foul Runoff Results

The drainage surveys are held digitally as video files and are available on request. A drainage survey report is included in Appendix B.

13. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of the Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy for the site, the following conclusions and recommendations are made:

- Reference to the EA'S Flood Map for Planning indicates the site is located within Flood Zone 1, and as such is considered to be at 'low' risk of flooding.
- The risk of flooding from groundwater, sewers, canals, and other artificial sources is considered to be low.
- The site is shown to be at risk of surface water flooding in the north of the site, however an effective surface water drainage system will satisfactorily manage the flood risk in this location.
- CCTV drainage surveys have confirmed the presence of the Pow Beck culvert (600mm dia.) running from north to south, in the east of the development site and below the footprint of the existing building.
- A CCTV drainage survey also confirmed the presence of 2 no. 225mm dia. foul sewers running parallel to each other, and parallel to the culvert under the footprint of the proposed building.
- The proposed development will extent the building footprint to the east, and its footprint will be sited over the culvert and both foul sewers. Build over agreements will need to be agreed with the LLFA and UU prior to commencement on site as it is not possible to divert the sewers or incorporate an easement due to the site constraints.
- Attenuation shall be provided within 2 no. geocellular tanks, located at the front and rear of the proposed care home. Hydrobrake flow control units will restrict discharge from the tanks to a combined rate of 2.1 l/s (Greenfield Qbar), providing significant betterment on the existing Brownfield site. It is recommended that silt traps are provided upstream of all storage structures.
- The site layout and drainage systems will be designed to ensure that there is no increased risk of flooding on or off the site as a result of extreme rainfall, lack of maintenance, blockages or other causes. The measures that will be implemented comprise drainage by attenuation, reducing runoff from car parking areas using half-batter curbs and the careful design of building layouts and details.
- A SuDS Operations and Maintenance Plan has been provided which outlines required maintenance for the surface water system to ensure long term operation
- Foul drainage will discharge by gravity into the foul sewers via a number of connection points around the proposed care home.

14. REFERENCES

- [1] Defra/Environment Agency, The Town and Country Planning Order 2015, 2015 No.595, April 2015.
- [2] British Geological Survey, 2020. Geoindex. http://mapapps2.bgs.ac.uk/geoindex/home.html
- [3] Land Information System (LANDIS)- Soilscapes viewer, Accessed January 2022 http://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes
- [4] Defra Magic Maps, 2022. https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx.
- [5] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, July 2018.
- [6] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Planning Practice Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework, October 2020.
- [7] JE, Jacobs, Copeland Borough Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), August 2007.
- [8] Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning. <u>https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/</u>
- [9] Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Risk Map. <u>https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map</u>
- [10] CIRIA, The SuDS Manual, Report C753, 2015.
- [11] BS8582:2013, Code of Practice for Surface Water Management, November 2013.
- [12] DEFRA/EA, Rainfall Runoff Management for Developments, SC030219, October 2013.
- [13] CIRIA, Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage Good Practice, Report C635, London, 2006.
- [14] Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Flood Estimation Handbook, Vols. 1 5 & FEH CD-ROM 3, 2009.
- [15] Institute of Hydrology, Flood Studies Report, Volume 1, Hydrological Studies, 1993.
- [16] Institute of Hydrology, Flood Studies Supplementary Report No 14 Review of Regional Growth Curves, August 1983.
- [17] Marshall & Bayliss, 1994. Flood Estimation for Small Catchments, Report No. 124 (IoH 124), Institute of Hydrology.
- [18] Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Non-Statutory Technical Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems, March 2015.
- [19] Causeway, Flow, 2022
- [20] Water UK, Design and Construction Guidance for Foul & Surface Water Sewers Offered for Adoption Under the Code for Adoption Agreements for Water and Sewage Companies Operating Wholly or Mainly in England, Approved Version 10, October 2019

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS





| Tana Dama a | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|--------|
| Rev De | escription | Date | Revised by | Checked by | Approv |
| A Foul Drai | nage updated | 21/04/22 | CA | OS | OS |
| B Indicative added | e private foul drainage | info 12/05/22 | CA | OS | OS |

Do not scale from this drawing

| R (| G PARKNS | Scale @ A1: 1/200 | First Issue: 31/01/2022 | Office of Origin: Kendal |
|----------|---|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Kenda | al 01539 729393 Lancaster 01524 32548 | Drawn by: CA | Checked by: RH | Approved: OS |
| Client: | TVH LTD | Project No: | Drawing No: | Rev: |
| Project: | Meadow Road | K38890 | 100 | В |
| | | | | |

APPENDIX B

UU SEWER RECORDS

DRAINAGE SURVEY REPORT



Crown copyright and database rights 2017 Ordnance Survey 100022432. Unauthorised reproduction will infringe these copyrights.

| Invert | Size x | Size y | Shape | Matl | Leng |
|--------|--------|--------|-------|------|--------|
| 24.04 | 1350 | | | CO | 30.03 |
| 24.04 | 1350 | | | CO | 30.03 |
| 18.69 | 150 | | | VC | 18.110 |
| 27.17 | 225 | | | VC | 34.13 |
| 27.17 | 225 | | | VC | 34.13 |
| 27.17 | 225 | | | VC | 34.13 |
| 27.17 | 225 | | | VC | 34.13 |
| 14.72 | 225 | | | VC | 60.207 |
| 14.72 | 225 | | | VC | 60.207 |
| 21.10 | 225 | | | VC | 20.027 |
| 47.00 | 100 | | | VC | 34.274 |
| 17.03 | 150 | | | VC | 51.735 |
| 17.03 | 150 | | | VC | 51./35 |
| 20.73 | 225 | | | VC | 73.10 |
| 0 | 450 | | | VC | 31.5/5 |
| 0 10 | 450 | | | VC | 31.575 |
| 26.19 | 225 | | | VC | 10 |
| 04.00 | 100 | | | VC | 50.445 |
| 21.99 | 150 | | | VC | /1.21/ |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 20.615 |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 20.615 |
| 23.65 | 225 | | | VC | 40.249 |
| 25.39 | 225 | | | VC | 49.348 |
| 19.58 | 225 | | | VC | 31.064 |
| 19.58 | 225 | | | VC | 31.064 |
| | 375 | | | CO | 7.7685 |
| | 375 | | | CO | 7.7685 |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 69.115 |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 69.115 |
| 18.89 | 225 | | | VC | 62.769 |
| 18.89 | 225 | | | VC | 62.769 |
| 27.65 | 300 | | | VC | 54.037 |
| 27.65 | 300 | | | VC | 54.037 |
| 27.65 | 300 | | | VC | 54.037 |
| 27.65 | 300 | | | VC | 54.037 |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 30.10 |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 30.10 |
| | 100 | | | VC | 35.411 |
| 27.44 | 525 | | | CO | 56.089 |
| | 150 | | | VC | 47.167 |
| | 150 | | | VC | 47.167 |
| 18.91 | 150 | | | VC | 18.950 |
| 22.28 | 225 | | | VC | 66.850 |
| 21.78 | 1200 | | | CO | 38.922 |
| 21.78 | 1200 | | | CO | 38.922 |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 61.269 |
| | 100 | | | VC | 14.183 |
| 17.8 | 300 | | | VC | 36.715 |
| | 150 | | | VC | 9.5798 |
| | 150 | | | VC | 9.5798 |
| | 150 | | | VC | 26.578 |
| 0 | 150 | | | VC | 48.795 |
| 15.47 | 450 | | | VC | 59.774 |
| 15.47 | 450 | | | VC | 59.774 |
| | 100 | | | VC | 14.306 |
| | 100 | | | VC | 14.306 |
| 0 | 225 | | | VC | 23.769 |
| 0 | 225 | | | VC | 23.769 |
| | 150 | | | VC | 24.899 |
| | 100 | | | VC | 50.872 |
| 15.74 | 225 | | | VC | 55.46 |
| 15.74 | 225 | | | VC | 55.46 |
| 25.93 | 225 | | | VC | 45.343 |

Grad 1 in 137 1 in 137



MANHOLE FUNCTION

| FO | Foul |
|----|---------------|
| SW | Surface Water |
| со | Combined |
| ov | Overflow |
| | |
| | |

SEWER SHAPE

| CI | Circular | TR | Trapezoidal |
|----|-------------|----|-------------|
| G | Egg | AR | Arch |
| VC | Oval | BA | Barrel |
| т | Flat Top | но | HorseShoe |
| RE | Rectangular | UN | Unspecified |
| SQ | Square | | |

SEWER MATERIAL

| AC | Asbestos Cement |
|-----|---------------------------|
| BR | Brick |
| PE | Polyethylene |
| RP | Reinforced Plastic Matrix |
| со | Concrete |
| CSB | Concrete Segment Bolted |
| CSU | Concrete Segment Unbolted |
| сс | Concrete Box Culverted |
| PSC | Plastic / Steel Composite |
| GRC | Glass Reinforecd Plastic |
| DI | Ductile Iron |
| PVC | Polyvinyl Chloride |
| CI | Cast Iron |
| SI | Spun Iron |
| ST | Steel |
| VC | Vitrified Clay |
| PP | Polypropylene |
| PF | Pitch Fibre |
| MAC | Masonry, Coursed |
| MAR | Masonry, Random |
| U | Unspecified |

Address or Site Reference:

3 LINK ROAD, WHITEHAVEN, CA28 8HJ

OS sheet NX9815SW Number: **Scale:** 1:1250 Nodes: **Sheet:** 1 of 4

SEWER

RECORDS

Date: 14/01/2022

Printed by: Property Searches

264



Water for the North West



| Project | |
|---------|--|
|---------|--|

| Project Name: | 2021-12-16669 RG Parkin Powbeck House Whitehaven |
|----------------------|--|
| Project Date: | 28/01/2022 |
| Inspection Standard: | MSCC5 Sewers & Drainage GB (SRM5 Scoring) |



R. G. PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD

Table of Contents

| Project NameProject NumberProject Date2021-12-16669 RG Parkin Powbeck House Whitehaven28/01/2022 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Information | ······ | P-1 | | | | | | | | |
| Section Item 1: F1 > F2 (F1X) | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Section Item 2: F2 > F3 (F2X) | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Section Item 3: F3 > S3 (F3X) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section Item 4: F4a > F4 (F4aX) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section Item 5: F4 > F5 (F4X) | | 7 | | | | | | | | |
| Section Item 6: F5 > F6 (F5X) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section Item 7: F7 > F4 (F7X) | | | | | | | | | | |

| | inDoctor | | Drain Doctor |
|--|---|----------------|------------------------------|
| John Market Contraction of the C | Project In | oformation | |
| 2021-12-16669 RG | Project Name Parkin Powbeck House Whitehaven | Project Number | Project Date 28/01/2022 |
| Client | | | |
| Company: Department: Street: Town or City: Post Code: | RG Parkin Meadowside Shap Road Kendal LA9 6NY | | R. G. PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD |
| Site | | | |
| Company: Department: Street: Town or City: | RG Parkin Pow Beck House Meadow Road Whitehaven | | |
| Contractor | | | |
| Company | | | |



| | | | Secti | on Ins | spection | - 18/01/ | 2022 - F | -1X | | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Item No. 1 Ope | Insp. No. 1 rator | Date 18/01/22 Veh | Time 12:22 | Client Not | t`s Job Ref Specified | Weather Not Spec | er ified ngth | Pre Cleaned No Legal Status | Alte | PLR F1X rnative ID |
| Not Sp Town or Vi | ecified | Not Sp | pecified | Not | Specified on Direction: | Not Spec | ified Ups | Not Specified | F1 | Specified |
| Road: Location: Surface Tv | pe: | | | Inspecte Total Le Joint Le | ed Length: ngth: ngth: | 17.57 m 17.57 m | Ups Dov Dov | tream Pipe De vnstream Node vnstream Pipe | epth: e: F2 Depth: | |
| Use: Type of Pij Flow Contr Year Cons Inspection Comments Recommen | be: rol: tructed: Purpose: :: ndations: | Foul Gravity dra Not Specifi Routine ins | in/sewer ed pection | | | Pipe Shape: Dia/Height: Material: Lining Type: Lining Materi | Circ 150 Poly No al: No | vular mm yvinyl chloride Lining Lining | | |
| Scale: 1 Dep F | 1:152 Po oth: m 1 | osition [m] | Code | Observ | vation | | | М | PEG Phot | o Grade |
| | | 0.00 | МН | Start no | ode, manhole, | reference: F1 | | 00: | 00:00 | |
| F Dep | 2 th: m | 17.57. | MHF | Finish | node, manhole | , reference: F2 | | 00:0 | 01:48 | |
| STR No. D | | | al Defects | TR Total | STR Grade | SER No. Def | Service & | Operational Ob | servations | SFR Grade |
| 0 | 0.0 | | .0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |



| | | | Sect | tion Ins | spection | - 18/01/ | 2022 - | F2X | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Item No. 2 Ope | Insp. No. 1 rator | Date 18/01/22 | Time 12:25 | Clien Not | t`s Job Ref Specified | Weath Not Spec Preset Le | er ified ngth | Pre Cleaned No Legal Status | Alte | PLR F2X rnative ID |
| Not Sp Town or Vi Road: Location: Surface Ty | ecified illage: pe: | Not S | Specified | Inspecti Inspecte Total Le Joint Le | Specified on Direction: ed Length: ngth: ngth: | Not Spec Downstream 15.48 m 15.48 m | ified Up Up Do | Not Specified ostream Node: ostream Pipe De ownstream Node | F2 e: F3 Depth: | Specified |
| Use: Type of Pip Flow Contr Year Cons Inspection Comments Recommen | rol: tructed: Purpose: :: ndations: | Foul Gravity dr Not Speci Routine ir | ain/sewer fied hspection | | | Pipe Shape: Dia/Height: Material: Lining Type: Lining Materi | Ci 15 Pc No al: No | rcular 50mm blyvinyl chloride b Lining b Lining | | |
| Scale: 1 Dep F | 1:134 Po oth: m 2 | osition [m] | Coc | le Observ | vation | | | М | PEG Pho | to Grade |
| | | 0.00 | MH | I Start n | ode, manhole, i | reference: F2 | | 00: | 00:00 | |
| ¥ | | 0.00 | WL | . Water | level, 0% of the | e vertical dimen | ision | 00: | 00:15 | |
| | | <u>14.33</u> 15.48 | WL MHI | - Water | level, 10% of th | e vertical dime | ension | 00: | 01:06 | |
| F Dep | 3 ath: m | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Construct Structu | ion ⊦eatur ral Defects | es | | | Mi Service a | scellaneous Feat & Operational Ob | tures oservations | |
| STR No. D 0 | ef STR P 0.0 | eak STF | 8 Mean 0.0 | STR Total 0.0 | STR Grade | SER No. Def 0 | SER Peak | SER Mean 0.0 | SER Total | SER Grade |



| | | | Section | on Ins | pection | - 18/01/ | 2022 - | F3X | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|
| Item No. | Insp. No. | Date | Time | Client | s Job Ref | Weath | er | Pre Cle | aned | | PLR | |
| 3 | 1 | 18/01/22 | 12:28 | Not | Specified | Not Spec | ified | No | | | F3X | |
| Ope Not Sr | rator becified | Not Sp | icle ecified | C Not | amera Specified | Preset Le | ified | Legal S Not Spe | tatus cified | Alte | rnativ Speci | e ID fied |
| | | not op | comea | Increativ | | Downotroom | | | | | opeoi | |
| Town or V | mage: | | | Inspectio | d Longth: | 2 57 m | | Ipstream No | ode: no Donth | F3 | | |
| Roau. | | | | Total Lo | a Lengin. | 3.57 m | | ownetroom | pe Deptin | ı. 62 | | |
| Surface Ty | (no: | | | | igin. aath: | 5.57 m | | ownstream | n Noue. Dine De | nth: | | |
| Junace Ty | pe. | Foul | | Joint Lei | igin. | Pine Shane | E | Sircular | i ripe De | pui. | | |
| Type of Pi | ne: | Gravity drai | n/sewer | | | Dia/Height: | 1 | 50 mm | | | | |
| Flow Cont | rol: | | | | | Material: | F | Polyvinyl chl | oride | | | |
| Year Cons | tructed: | Not Specifie | ed | | | Lining Type: | 1 | No Linina | | | | |
| Inspection | Purpose: | Routine ins | pection | | | Lining Materi | al: N | No Lining | | | | |
| Comments | S: | | • | | | U | | | | | | |
| Recomme | ndations: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scale: | 1:50 P | osition [m] | Code | Observ | ation | | | | MPEG | B Pho | to | Grade |
| F | ⁷³ | 0.00 | МН | Start no | ode, manhole, | reference: F3 | | | 00:00:0 | 00 | | |
| | | 0.00 | WL | Water I | evel, 0% of the | e vertical dimer | ision | | 00:00:4 | 12 | | |
| | | 0.87 | JN | Junctio | n at 09 o'clock | , 150mm dia | | | 00:00:1 | 16 | | |
| ¥ | | _1.11_ | MCVC | Pipe m | aterial changes | s to vitrified cla | y at this poi | nt | 00:00:2 | 21 | | |
| S Dep | 53 oth: m | _3.57_ | MHF | Finish r | iode, manhole | , reference: S3 | | | 00:00:3 | 32 | | |
| | | Constructio | n Features | | | | N | liscellaneou | s Feature | S | | |
| STR No. D | ef STR P | eak STR | Mean ST | R Total | STR Grade | SER No. Def | SER Pea | k SER M | | ER Total | SER | Grade |
| 0 | 0.0 | 0. | 0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | 1.0 |



| | | | Sect | tion Ins | pection | - 18/01/2 | 2022 - F | 4aX | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Item No. 4 | Insp. No. 2 | Date 18/01/22 | Time 13:01 | e Client 1 Not | t` s Job Ref Specified | Weath Not Spec | er ified | Pre Cleane No | ed | F F | PLR 4AX |
| Ope Not Sp | rator ecified | Ve Not S | hicle pecified | C Not | amera Specified | Preset Le Not Spec | ngth ified | Legal Statu Not Specifie | u s ed | Alterr Not S | native ID specified |
| Town or Vi Road: Location: Surface Ty | illage: | | <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u> | Inspecti Inspecte Total Le Joint Le | on Direction: ed Length: ngth: ngth: | Downstream 16.04 m 16.04 m | Ups Ups Dov Dov | stream Node stream Pipe vnstream No vnstream Pi | Depth: ode: pe Depth: | F4A F4 | |
| Use: Type of Pij Flow Contr Year Cons Inspection Comments Recomments | oe: rol: tructed: Purpose: s: odations: | Foul Gravity dra Not Speci Routine in | ain/sewer fied spection | | | Pipe Shape: Dia/Height: Material: Lining Type: Lining Materi | Circ 225 Vitri No al: No | cular mm ified clay Lining Lining | | | |
| Scale: 1 Dep F4 | 1:139 Po oth: m 4a | osition [m] | Co | de Observ | vation | | | | MPEG | Photo | Grade |
| | | 0.00 | M | H Start no | ode, manhole, | reference: F4a: | Camera in re | verse (| 00:00:00 | | |
| ¥ | | _0.00_ | W | L Water | evel, 5% of the | e vertical dimen | sion | | 00:00:26 | | |
| F Dep | r4 eth: m | 16.04 | MH | 1F Finish i | node, manhole | , reference: F4 | | (| 00:00:00 | | |
| | | Construct Structur | ion Featu ral Defect | res s | | | Misc Service & | cellaneous For Operational | eatures Observatio | ns | |
| STR No. D 0 | ef STR P 0.0 | eak STR | 8 Mean 0.0 | STR Total 0.0 | STR Grade 1.0 | SER No. Def | SER Peak 0.0 | SER Mea 0.0 | n SER T 0.0 | otal | SER Grade 1.0 |



| | | | Se | ctio | n Ins | pection | - 18/01/2 | 2022 - | - F4a | X | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Item No. | Insp. No | o. Dat | е Т | ime | Client | s Job Ref | Weath | er | Pre | Cleaned | | PL | .R |
| 4 | 1 | 18/01 | /22 12 | 2:59 | Not | Specified | Not Spec | ified | | No | | F4/ | AX |
| Oper Not Sp | rator | N | Vehicle | - d | C | amera | Preset Le | ength | Leg | al Status | | Alterna | tive ID |
| Not Sp | ecified | | ot Specifie | ea | | Specified | Not Spec | lified | INOt | Specified | | NOT SP | ecified |
| Town or Vi | illage: | | | | Inspectio | on Direction: | Upstream | | Upstrea | m Node: | | F4A | |
| Road: | | | | | Inspecte | d Length: | 16.04 m | | Upstream | n Pipe De | epth: | | |
| Location: | | | | | Total Le | ngth: | 16.04 m | | Downstr | eam Nod | e: | F4 | |
| Surface Ty | pe: | | | | Joint Le | ngth: | | | Downstr | eam Pipe | Dept | า: | |
| Use: | | Foul | | | | | Pipe Shape: | | Circular | | | | |
| Type of Pip | pe: | Gravity | / drain/sev | ver | | | Dia/Height: | | 225 mm | | | | |
| Flow Contr | rol: | | | | | | Material: | | Vitrified of | clay | | | |
| Year Const | tructed: | Not Sp | ecified | | | | Lining Type: | | No Lining | g | | | |
| Inspection | Purpose | : Routin | e inspecti | on | | | Lining Materi | ial: | No Lining | g | | | |
| Comments | 5: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommer | ndations: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scale: 1 | 1:139 | Position | [m] | Code | Observ | ation | | | | M | PEG | Photo | Grade |
| Dep | th: m | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 0.00 | | MH | Start no | de, manhole, | reference: F4 | | | 00: | 00:00 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | $ \setminus \rangle$ | × 0.00 | | WI | Water I | evel. 15% of th | ne vertical dime | ension | | 00: | 00.02 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 0.65 | | DEF | Attache | d deposits, fou | uling from 04 o' | clock to 0 | 8 o'clock, | 00: | 00:13 | Upstream | 1 3 |
| | | | | | 13 /6 01 | | area 1055 | | | | | 84-fbcd-4 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 40.04 | | | Fisish | | | | | 00. | 00.04 | | |
| | 5 | | | MHF | Finish r | ode, mannole | , reference: F4 | a: in gara | ge | 00: | 02:24 | | |
| |) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F4 | 4a | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dep | th: m | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Const | ruction Fe | atures | | | | Conde | Miscellan | eous Feat | tures | tions | |
| STR No. D | ef STR | Peak 9 | STR Mean | ອບເວ ງ ST | R Total | STR Grade | SER No. Def | SER Pe | ak SF | R Mean | SER | Total S | ER Grade |
| 0 | 0 | .0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1 | 2.0 | | 0.1 | 2 | 2.0 | 3.0 |

| DrainDoctor |
|---------------------------------|
| brainage & Fibilibilig services |

| Section Pictures - 18/01/2 | 2022 - F4aX |
|----------------------------|-------------|
|----------------------------|-------------|

| Item No. | Inspection Direction | PLR | Client's Job Ref | Contractor's Job Ref |
|----------|----------------------|------|------------------|----------------------|
| 4 | Upstream | F4AX | | |



UpstreamX_970b3284-fbcd-44e6-90d8-87792fdef5ee_202201 28_081359_907.jpg, 00:00:13, 0.65 m Attached deposits, fouling from 04 o'clock to 08 o'clock, 15% cross-sectional area loss







| | | | Sect | ion Ins | spection | - 18/01/ | 2022 - F | -5X | | |
|--|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Item No. 6 | Insp. No. 1 | Date 18/01/22 | Time 13:51 | Clien Not | t`s Job Ref Specified | Weath Not Spec | er ified | Pre Cleaned No | | PLR F5X |
| Opera Not Spe | ator cified | Not S | ehicle Specified | C Not | amera Specified | Preset Le Not Spec | ngth ified | Legal Status Not Specified | Al | ternative ID ot Specified |
| Town or Vill Road: Location: Surface Typ | age: | | · | Inspecti Inspecte Total Le Joint Le | on Direction: ed Length: ngth: nath: | Downstream 22.83 m 22.83 m | Ups Ups Dov Dov | stream Node: stream Pipe De wnstream Nod wnstream Pipe | F5 epth: e: F6 Depth: | |
| Use: Type of Pipe Flow Contro Year Constr Inspection I Comments: Recommend | e: bl: ucted: Purpose: dations: | Foul Gravity du Not Spec Routine in | rain/sewer ified nspection | | | Pipe Shape: Dia/Height: Material: Lining Type: Lining Materi | Cira 225 Vitr No al: No | cular 5 mm ified clay Lining Lining | | |
| Scale: 1: | 197 Pc | osition [m |] Cod | e Obser | vation | | | М | PEG Ph | oto Grade |
| F5 | | 0.00 | MH | Start n Water | ode, manhole, level, 5% of the | reference: F5 | sion: flowing | 00: | 00:00 | |
| F6 Dept | h: m | Construc | MHI tion Feature | - Finish | node, manhole | , reference: F6 | Mis | 00: cellaneous Fea | 02:02 | |
| STR No. De | f STR Pe | eak STI | R Mean | STR Total | STR Grade | SER No. Def | SER Peak | SER Mean | SER Tota | I SER Grade |
| 0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |



| | | | Sect | ion Ins | spection | - 18/01/ | 2022 - | F7X | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|-------------------|----------|----------|
| Item No. 1 | nsp. No. 1 | Date 18/01/22 | Time 15:05 | Client Not | t`s Job Ref Specified | Weath Not Spec | er ified | Pre Cleaned No | d | P F | LR 7X |
| Not Spe | cified | Not Sp | ecified | Not | Specified | Not Spec | ified | Not Specifie | s d | Not S | pecified |
| Town or Villa Road: Location: | age: | | | Inspecti Inspecte Total Le | on Direction: ed Length: ngth: | Downstream 22.73 m 22.73 m | UUUD | pstream Node: pstream Pipe I ownstream No | Depth: de: | F7 F4 | |
| Surface Typ | e: | | | Joint Le | ngth: | | D | ownstream Pip | e Depth: | | |
| Use: Type of Pipe Flow Contro Year Constru Inspection P | : I: ucted: urpose: | Foul Gravity drain Not Specifie Routine insp | n/sewer d | | | Pipe Shape: Dia/Height: Material: Lining Type: Lining Materi | C 2 V N al: N | ircular 25mm itrified clay lo Lining lo Lining | | | |
| Comments: Recommend | ations: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scale: 1:' Deptr F7 | 96 Po 1: m | sition [m] | Code | e Observ | vation | | | I | MPEG | Photo | Grade |
| |) | 0.00 | MH | Start no | ode, manhole, | reference: F7 | | 00 | 0:00:00 | | |
| | | 0.00 | WL | Water I | evel, 10% of th | ne vertical dime | ension: flowi | ng 00 | 0:00:19 | | |
| • | 1 | <u>4.50</u> | CUW | ' Loss of | [;] vision, camera | a under water | | 00 | 0:01:41 | | |
| F4 Depth | 2 :: m | Constructio | MHF | Finish i | node, manhole | , reference: F4 | М | 00 iscellaneous Fe | 0:02:31 atures | | |
| 070 11 - | 075 - | Structural | Defects | | | 050 | Service | & Operational C | Observatio | ns | 055 0 |
| 0 | 0.0 | eark SIRI 0. | nean S 0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | O DEK NO. Det | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5ER I 0.0 |)) | 1.0 |

APPENDIX C

DRAINAGE CALCULATIONS



Design Settings

| Rainfall Methodology | FEH-13 | Minimum Velocity (m/s) | 1.00 |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Return Period (years) | 100 | Connection Type | Level Soffits |
| Additional Flow (%) | 40 | Minimum Backdrop Height (m) | 0.200 |
| CV | 0.840 | Preferred Cover Depth (m) | 0.900 |
| Time of Entry (mins) | 5.00 | Include Intermediate Ground | \checkmark |
| Maximum Time of Concentration (mins) | 30.00 | Enforce best practice design rules | \checkmark |
| Maximum Rainfall (mm/hr) | 50.0 | | |

<u>Nodes</u>

| Name | Area (ha) | T of E (mins) | Cover Level | Diameter (mm) | Easting (m) | Northing (m) | Depth (m) |
|------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | | (m) | | | | |
| POW BECK 1 | | | 26.030 | 1500 | 298426.967 | 515510.054 | 2.210 |
| POW BECK 2 | | | 25.430 | 1500 | 298413.665 | 515483.316 | 2.670 |
| POW BECK 3 | | | 23.910 | 1500 | 298394.473 | 515451.196 | 2.500 |
| MHS01 | 0.139 | 5.00 | 26.300 | 1200 | 298379.686 | 515530.991 | 1.600 |
| MHS02 | | | 25.500 | 1200 | 298421.060 | 515520.878 | 1.148 |
| TI1 | | | 26.100 | | 298381.542 | 515530.246 | 1.664 |
| TO1 | | 5.00 | 25.600 | | 298409.758 | 515525.335 | 1.167 |
| MHS03 | 0.112 | 5.00 | 25.300 | 1200 | 298389.028 | 515495.995 | 0.850 |
| MHS04 | | | 25.300 | 1200 | 298411.288 | 515487.008 | 1.950 |
| TO2 | | 5.00 | 25.300 | | 298409.436 | 515487.761 | 1.900 |
| TI2 | | | 25.300 | | 298390.884 | 515495.251 | 1.898 |

<u>Links</u>

| Name | US | DS | Length | ks (mm) / | US IL | DS IL | Fall | Slope | Dia | T of C | Rain |
|-------|------------|------------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-------|------|--------|---------|
| | Node | Node | (m) | n | (m) | (m) | (m) | (1:X) | (mm) | (mins) | (mm/hr) |
| 1.000 | POW BECK 1 | POW BECK 2 | 29.864 | 0.600 | 23.820 | 22.760 | 1.060 | 28.2 | 600 | 5.61 | 50.0 |
| 1.001 | POW BECK 2 | POW BECK 3 | 37.417 | 0.600 | 22.760 | 21.410 | 1.350 | 27.7 | 600 | 5.74 | 50.0 |
| 2.000 | MHS01 | TI1 | 2.000 | 0.600 | 24.700 | 24.658 | 0.042 | 47.6 | 150 | 5.02 | 50.0 |
| 2.001 | TO1 | MHS02 | 12.149 | 0.600 | 24.433 | 24.352 | 0.081 | 150.0 | 150 | 5.25 | 50.0 |
| 2.002 | MHS02 | POW BECK 1 | 12.331 | 0.600 | 24.352 | 24.270 | 0.082 | 150.4 | 150 | 5.50 | 50.0 |
| 3.000 | MHS03 | TI2 | 2.000 | 0.600 | 24.450 | 24.425 | 0.025 | 80.0 | 150 | 5.03 | 50.0 |
| 3.001 | TO2 | MHS04 | 1.999 | 0.600 | 23.400 | 23.350 | 0.050 | 40.0 | 150 | 5.02 | 50.0 |
| 3.002 | MHS04 | POW BECK 2 | 4.391 | 0.600 | 23.350 | 23.210 | 0.140 | 31.4 | 150 | 5.06 | 50.0 |

| Name | Vel (m/s) | Cap (I/s) | Flow (I/s) | US Depth | DS Depth | Σ Area (ha) | Σ Add Inflow |
|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | (m) | (m) | . , | (I/s) |
| 1.000 | 4.599 | 1300.3 | 0.0 | 1.610 | 2.070 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
| 1.001 | 4.637 | 1311.0 | 0.0 | 2.070 | 1.900 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
| 2.000 | 1.461 | 25.8 | 29.5 | 1.450 | 1.292 | 0.139 | 0.0 |
| 2.001 | 0.818 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 1.017 | 0.998 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
| 2.002 | 0.817 | 14.4 | 0.0 | 0.998 | 1.610 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
| 3.000 | 1.125 | 19.9 | 23.8 | 0.700 | 0.725 | 0.112 | 0.0 |
| 3.001 | 1.596 | 28.2 | 0.0 | 1.750 | 1.800 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
| 3.002 | 1.804 | 31.9 | 0.0 | 1.800 | 2.070 | 0.000 | 0.0 |

| CAUSEW | | R G | Parkins | & Partners | Ltd | File: K38 Network Rachel H 16/02/2 | 890 - Copy c: Storm Ne leron 022 | | Page 2 | | | |
|--------|--------|-------|---------|------------|-------------------|---|---|---------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| | | | | | <u>Pipeline S</u> | <u>Schedule</u> | | | | | | |
| Link | Length | Slope | Dia | Link | US CL | US IL | US Dept | h DS | CL | DS IL | DS Depth | |
| | (m) | (1:X) | (mm) | Туре | (m) | (m) | (m) | (n | n) | (m) | (m) | |
| 1.000 | 29.864 | 28.2 | 600 | Circular | 26.030 | 23.820 | 1.61 | 0 25.4 | 430 | 22.760 | 2.070 | |
| 1.001 | 37.417 | 27.7 | 600 | Circular | 25.430 | 22.760 | 2.07 | 0 23.9 | 910 | 21.410 | 1.900 | |
| 2.000 | 2.000 | 47.6 | 150 | Circular | 26.300 | 24.700 | 1.45 | 0 26.3 | 100 | 24.658 | 1.292 | |
| 2.001 | 12.149 | 150.0 | 150 | Circular | 25.600 | 24.433 | 1.01 | 7 25. | 500 | 24.352 | 0.998 | |
| 2.002 | 12.331 | 150.4 | 150 | Circular | 25.500 | 24.352 | 0.99 | 8 26.0 | 030 | 24.270 | 1.610 | |
| 3.000 | 2.000 | 80.0 | 150 | Circular | 25.300 | 24.450 | 0.70 | 0 25.3 | 300 | 24.425 | 0.725 | |
| 3.001 | 1.999 | 40.0 | 150 | Circular | 25.300 | 23.400 | 1.75 | 0 25.3 | 300 | 23.350 | 1.800 | |
| 3.002 | 4.391 | 31.4 | 150 | Circular | 25.300 | 23.350 | 1.80 | 0 25.4 | 430 | 23.210 | 2.070 | |
| Link | U | 5 | Dia | Node | МН | | DS | Dia | No | ode | МН | |
| | No | de | (mm) | Туре | Туре | 1 | Vode | (mm) | Ту | /pe | Туре | |
| 1.000 | POW B | ECK 1 | 1500 | Manhole | Adoptab | ple POV | V BECK 2 | 1500 | Mar | hole | Adoptable | |
| 1.001 | POW B | ECK 2 | 1500 | Manhole | Adoptab | ple POV | V BECK 3 | 1500 | Mar | hole | Adoptable | |
| 2.000 | MHS01 | - | 1200 | Manhole | Adoptab | ole TI1 | | | Juno | tion | | |
| 2.001 | TO1 | | | Junction | | MHS | 502 | 1200 | Mar | hole | Adoptable | |
| 2.002 | MHS02 | 2 | 1200 | Manhole | Adoptab | ple POV | V BECK 1 | 1500 | Mar | hole | Adoptable | |
| 3.000 | MHS03 | ; | 1200 | Manhole | Adoptab | ole TI2 | | | Juno | ction | | |
| 3.001 | TO2 | | | Junction | | MHS | 504 | 1200 | Mar | hole | Adoptable | |
| 3.002 | MHS04 | ļ | 1200 | Manhole | Adoptab | ple POV | V BECK 2 | 1500 | Mar | hole | Adoptable | |
| | | | | Ī | Manhole | <u>Schedule</u> | | | | | | |
| Node | Eas | ting | North | ning C | L Dep | oth Dia | a Con | nectior | ns | Link | IL Dia | |

| Noue | Lasung | Northing | | Deptil | | connection | 3 | LIIIK | | |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------|---------|------|------------|---|-------|--------|------|
| | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (mm) | | | | (m) | (mm) |
| POW BECK 1 | 298426.967 | 515510.054 | 26.030 | 2.210 | 1500 | | 1 | 2.002 | 24.270 | 150 |
| | | | | | | 04 | 0 | 1.000 | 23.820 | 600 |
| POW BECK 2 | 298413.665 | 515483.316 | 25.430 | 2.670 | 1500 | 1 2 | 1 | 3.002 | 23.210 | 150 |
| | | | | | | \bowtie | 2 | 1.000 | 22.760 | 600 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 1.001 | 22.760 | 600 |
| POW BECK 3 | 298394.473 | 515451.196 | 23.910 | 2.500 | 1500 | \bigcirc | 1 | 1.001 | 21.410 | 600 |
| MHS01 | 298379.686 | 515530.991 | 26.300 | 1.600 | 1200 | | 0 | 2,000 | 24 700 | 150 |
| 144602 | 200424 000 | 545520.070 | 25 500 | 4 4 4 0 | 1200 | | 0 | 2.000 | 24.700 | 150 |
| MHSUZ | 298421.060 | 515520.878 | 25.500 | 1.148 | 1200 | | 1 | 2.001 | 24.352 | 150 |
| T 14 | 200204 542 | 545520.246 | 26 4 0 0 | 1.001 | | 0 | 0 | 2.002 | 24.352 | 150 |
| | 298381.542 | 515530.246 | 26.100 | 1.004 | | 1 | T | 2.000 | 24.058 | 150 |
| TO1 | 298409.758 | 515525.335 | 25.600 | 1.167 | | °~>0 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 0 | 2.001 | 24.433 | 150 |



| Node | Easting | Northing | CL | Depth | Dia | Connection | ns | Link | IL | Dia | | |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|-----------|-------------|------|--|--|
| | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (mm) | | | | (m) | (mm) | | |
| MHS03 | 298389.028 | 515495.995 | 25.300 | 0.850 | 1200 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | 0 | 3 000 | 24 450 | 150 | | |
| MHS04 | 298411 288 | 515487 008 | 25 300 | 1 950 | 1200 | | 1 | 3.000 | 24.430 | 150 | | |
| 1011304 | 250411.200 | 515467.000 | 25.500 | 1.550 | 1200 | 1 | - | 5.001 | 23.550 | 100 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 3.002 | 23.350 | 150 | | |
| TO2 | 298409.436 | 515487.761 | 25.300 | 1.900 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | م | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | >0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | 4 0 0 0 | | | 0 | 3.001 | 23.400 | 150 | | |
| 112 | 298390.884 | 515495.251 | 25.300 | 1.898 | | | 1 | 3.000 | 24.425 | 150 | | |
| | | | | | | · ~ ~ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | I | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | <u>s</u> | imulation | <u>Settings</u> | | | | | | | |
| De infell | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rainfall MethodologyFEH-13Skip Steady StatexCheck Discharge VolumeSummar O/0.750Drain Down Times (mins)240100 was 260 minute (mill) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Winter CV | 0.750 | Diain Additio | nal Storage | m^{3}/h^{3} | 240 10 | JU ye | ai 500 ii | iniute (iii |) | | |
| | Analysis Sneed | Normal | Chec | k Discharg | e Rate(s |) _/ | | | | | | |
| | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 30 60 | 120 1 | 80 | Storm Dur | ations | 180 600 | 72 | | 60 1 | 440 | | |
| 15 | 50 00 | 120 1 | | 240 30 | | | , , 2 | | .00 1 | 0 | | |
| | Retu | urn Period Cl | imate C | hange A | dditiona | l Area Addit | tional | Flow | | | | |
| | | (years) | (CC % | 6) 0 | (A % |) 0 | (Q %) | 0 | | | | |
| | | 30 | | 40 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | | 100 | | 40 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | | 100 | | 40 | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | | | - | | - | | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | Pre-dev | elopment | Discharg | <u>e Rate</u> | | | | | | |
| | | Sita MA | akoun | Greenfield | 4 6 | Frowth Factor | 20.00 | ar 101 | 5 | | | |
| | | Greenfield M | ethod | IH174 | | owth Factor 1 | 00 ye | ar 2.4 | 5 R | | | |
| | Positive | ly Drained Are | a (ha) | | | Betterm | ent (9 | %) 0 | | | | |
| | SAAR (mm) Betterment (%) U | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Soil Index 1 O 1 vear (I/s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SPR 0.10 Q 30 year (I/s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Region 1 Q 100 year (l/s) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | C | Growth Factor | 1 year | 0.85 | | - | | | | | | |
| | Pre-development Discharge Volume | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | <u>PI</u> | e-uevel | opinent D | scharge | volume | | | | | | |

| Site Makeup | Greenfield | Return Period (years) | 100 |
|------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Greenfield Method | FSR/FEH | Climate Change (%) | 0 |
| Positively Drained Area (ha) | | Storm Duration (mins) | 360 |
| Soil Index | 1 | Betterment (%) | 0 |
| SPR | 0.10 | PR | |
| CWI | | Runoff Volume (m ³) | |

| CAUSEWAY 😜 | R G Parkir | is & Partn | ers Ltd | Fil Ne Ra 16 | e: K38890 etwork: Sto ichel Heror 5/02/2022 | - Copי orm N ו | y.pfd etwork | | Page 4 | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------------|
| | | Node MH | ISO2 Onlii | ne Hyd | ro-Brake® | Contr | <u>rol</u> | | | | |
| Fla Replaces Downstre Invert Le Design De Design Fl | ve (ole v er (m) (m) 1 | (HE) Mir √ CTL-SHE 0.100 1200 | nimise -0068- | upstream si 1600-0400- | torage 1600 | | | | | | |
| | | Node MH | IS04 Onlii | ne Hyd | ro-Brake [®] | Contr | <u>rol</u> | | | | |
| Fla Replaces Downstre Invert Le Design De Design Fl | p Valve am Link evel (m) pth (m) ow (l/s) | x √ 23.350 1.200 0.5 | Min C Min No | Su Proo Dutlet I ode Dia | Objecti mp Availab duct Numb Diameter (n ameter (mr | ve (ole v er (m) (m) 1 | (HE) Mir √ CTL-SHE 0.075 1200 | nimise -0031- | upstream si 5000-1200- | torage -5000 | |
| | <u>N</u> (| ode TO1 F | low throu | ugh Po | nd Storage | Struc | <u>cture</u> | | | | |
| Base Inf Coefficient (m/hr) Side Inf Coefficient (m/hr) Safety Factor | 0.00000 0.00000 2.0 | Time | Inve to half e | Poi ert Leve mpty (i | rosity 0.9 el (m) 24. mins) | 95 .433 | Ma Ma | in Chai in Chai I | nnel Length nnel Slope (Main Chann | (m) 1:X) iel n | 28.000 10000.0 0.020 |
| | | | | Inlets TI1 | | | | | | | |
| Depth A (m) (r 0.000 21 | rea Inf . n²) (n .0.0 | Area n²) 0.0 | Depth (m) 0.400 | Area (m²) 210.0 | Inf Area (m²) 0.0 | | Depth (m) 0.401 | Area (m²) 0.0 | Inf Area (m²) 0.0 | | |
| | <u>N</u> | ode TO2 F | low throu | ugh Po | nd Storage | Struc | <u>cture</u> | | | | |
| Base Inf Coefficient (m/hr) Side Inf Coefficient (m/hr) Safety Factor | 0.00000 0.00000 2.0 | Time | Inve to half e | Poi ert Leve mpty (i | rosity 0.9 el (m) 23. mins) | 95 .400 | Ma Ma | in Chai in Chai I | nnel Length nnel Slope (Main Chann | (m) 1:X) iel n | 20.000 10000.0 0.020 |
| | | | | Inlets TI2 | | | | | | | |
| Depth A (m) (1 0.000 8 | rea Inf m²) (n :0.0 | Area n²) 0.0 | Depth (m) 1.200 | Area (m²) 80.0 | Inf Area (m²) 0.0 | D e (1 | epth (m) .201 | Area (m²) 0.0 | Inf Area (m²) 0.0 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |



| Results for 30 year Critical Storm Duration | n. Lowest mass balance: 98.73% |
|---|--------------------------------|
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |

| Node Event | US Node | Peak (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| 15 minute summer | POW BECK 1 | 12 | 23.836 | 0.016 | 1.6 | 0.0288 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 1200 | 22.778 | 0.018 | 2.0 | 0.0316 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 3 | 1200 | 21.427 | 0.017 | 2.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute winter | MHS01 | 10 | 24.975 | 0.275 | 40.6 | 0.7889 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 240 minute winter | MHS02 | 228 | 24.614 | 0.262 | 3.5 | 0.2962 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 240 minute winter | TI1 | 228 | 24.615 | 0.179 | 9.2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 240 minute winter | TO1 | 228 | 24.615 | 0.182 | 5.6 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 10 | 24.680 | 0.230 | 32.7 | 0.8672 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | MHS04 | 1320 | 23.986 | 0.636 | 1.0 | 0.7198 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | TO2 | 1320 | 23.986 | 0.586 | 1.8 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | TI2 | 1320 | 23.986 | 0.584 | 2.1 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |

| Link Event (Outflow) | US Node | Link | DS Node | Outflow (I/s) | Velocity (m/s) | Flow/Cap | Link Vol (m³) | Discharge Vol (m³) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 15 minute winter | POW BECK 1 | 1.000 | POW BECK 2 | 1.6 | 0.798 | 0.001 | 0.0632 | |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 1.001 | POW BECK 3 | 2.0 | 0.870 | 0.002 | 0.0849 | 119.9 |
| 15 minute winter 30 minute summer | MHS01 MHS02 | 2.000 Hydro-Brake® | TI1 POW BECK 1 | 39.5 1.6 | 2.245 | 1.530 | 0.0349 | |
| 15 minute summer | TI1 | Flow through pond | TO1 | 30.5 | 0.116 | 0.071 | 15.2988 | |
| 15 minute summer | TO1 | 2.001 | MHS02 | 4.5 | 0.530 | 0.314 | 0.1632 | |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 3.000 | TI2 | 31.8 | 1.805 | 1.599 | 0.0349 | |
| 1440 minute winter | MHS04 | Hydro-Brake [®] | POW BECK 2 | 0.4 | | | | |
| 30 minute summer | TO2 | 3.001 | MHS04 | 4.9 | 0.566 | 0.174 | 0.0352 | |
| 15 minute summer | TI2 | Flow through pond | TO2 | 16.2 | 0.109 | 0.013 | 12.5484 | |



| Results for 30 y | year +40% CC Critical Storm Duration. | Lowest mass balance: 98.73% |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | |

| Node Event | US Node | Peak (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| 15 minute summer | POW BECK 1 | 11 | 23.836 | 0.016 | 1.6 | 0.0287 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 1590 | 22.778 | 0.018 | 2.0 | 0.0320 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 3 | 1590 | 21.428 | 0.018 | 2.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute winter | MHS01 | 11 | 25.134 | 0.434 | 56.7 | 1.2445 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 360 minute winter | MHS02 | 336 | 24.715 | 0.363 | 3.7 | 0.4102 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 360 minute winter | TI1 | 336 | 24.716 | 0.280 | 9.8 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 360 minute winter | TO1 | 336 | 24.716 | 0.283 | 5.7 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 11 | 24.784 | 0.334 | 45.7 | 1.2571 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | MHS04 | 1380 | 24.284 | 0.934 | 1.4 | 1.0565 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | TO2 | 1380 | 24.284 | 0.884 | 1.8 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | TI2 | 1380 | 24.284 | 0.882 | 2.9 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |

| Link Event (Outflow) | US Node | Link | DS Node | Outflow (I/s) | Velocity (m/s) | Flow/Cap | Link Vol (m³) | Discharge Vol (m³) |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 15 minute winter | POW BECK 1 | 1.000 | POW BECK 2 | 1.6 | 0.799 | 0.001 | 0.0628 | |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 1.001 | POW BECK 3 | 2.0 | 0.878 | 0.002 | 0.0866 | 155.4 |
| 15 minute winter | MHS01 | 2.000 Hudro Brako® | TI1 DOW RECK 1 | 54.7 | 3.108 | 2.118 | 0.0349 | |
| 15 minute summer | TI1 | Flow through pond | TO1 | 36.5 | 0.125 | 0.085 | 24.4632 | |
| 15 minute summer | TO1 | 2.001 | MHS02 | 4.8 | 0.543 | 0.334 | 0.1919 | |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 3.000 | TI2 | 44.1 | 2.505 | 2.218 | 0.0349 | |
| 1440 minute winter | MHS04 | Hydro-Brake [®] | POW BECK 2 | 0.4 | | | | |
| 15 minute winter | TO2 | 3.001 | MHS04 | 4.9 | 0.744 | 0.175 | 0.0352 | |
| 15 minute winter | TI2 | Flow through pond | TO2 | 22.4 | 0.118 | 0.018 | 19.9104 | |



| Node Event | US Node | Peak (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| 15 minute winter | POW BECK 1 | 11 | 23.836 | 0.016 | 1.6 | 0.0288 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 1440 | 22.778 | 0.018 | 2.0 | 0.0318 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 3 | 1440 | 21.428 | 0.018 | 2.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute winter | MHS01 | 10 | 25.094 | 0.394 | 53.2 | 1.1299 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 240 minute winter | MHS02 | 232 | 24.687 | 0.335 | 2.7 | 0.3794 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 240 minute winter | TI1 | 232 | 24.688 | 0.252 | 12.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 240 minute winter | TO1 | 232 | 24.688 | 0.255 | 6.8 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 10 | 24.757 | 0.307 | 42.8 | 1.1550 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 960 minute winter | MHS04 | 930 | 24.166 | 0.816 | 3.2 | 0.9226 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 960 minute winter | TO2 | 930 | 24.166 | 0.766 | 2.3 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 960 minute winter | TI2 | 930 | 24.166 | 0.764 | 3.5 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |

| Link Event (Outflow) | US Node | Link | DS Node | Outflow (I/s) | Velocity (m/s) | Flow/Cap | Link Vol (m³) | Discharge Vol (m³) |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 30 minute summer | POW BECK 1 | 1.000 | POW BECK 2 | 1.6 | 0.786 | 0.001 | 0.0629 | |
| 1440 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 1.001 | POW BECK 3 | 2.0 | 0.876 | 0.002 | 0.0861 | 143.3 |
| 15 minute winter | MHS01 | 2.000 Hudro Brako® | TI1 DOW RECK 1 | 51.2 | 2.910 | 1.983 | 0.0349 | |
| 15 minute summer | TI1 | Flow through pond | TO1 | 35.8 | 0.129 | 0.083 | 20.2377 | |
| 15 minute summer | TO1 | 2.001 | MHS02 | 5.1 | 0.540 | 0.354 | 0.1854 | |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 3.000 | TI2 | 41.2 | 2.342 | 2.074 | 0.0349 | |
| 960 minute winter | MHS04 | Hydro-Brake [®] | POW BECK 2 | 0.4 | | | | |
| 15 minute summer | TO2 | 3.001 | MHS04 | 5.6 | 0.637 | 0.200 | 0.0352 | |
| 15 minute winter | TI2 | Flow through pond | то2 | 21.7 | 0.116 | 0.017 | 18.5801 | |



Results for 100 year +40% CC Critical Storm Duration. Lowest mass balance: 98.73%

| Node Event | US Node | Peak (mins) | Level (m) | Depth (m) | Inflow (I/s) | Node Vol (m³) | Flood (m³) | Status |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| 360 minute winter | POW BECK 1 | 344 | 23.837 | 0.017 | 1.7 | 0.0296 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 360 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 344 | 22.779 | 0.019 | 2.2 | 0.0331 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 360 minute winter | POW BECK 3 | 344 | 21.428 | 0.018 | 2.2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 15 minute winter | MHS01 | 11 | 25.369 | 0.669 | 74.2 | 1.9189 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 360 minute winter | MHS02 | 344 | 24.829 | 0.477 | 4.0 | 0.5391 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 360 minute winter | TI1 | 344 | 24.830 | 0.394 | 13.4 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |
| 360 minute winter | TO1 | 344 | 24.830 | 0.397 | 12.5 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 11 | 24.936 | 0.486 | 59.9 | 1.8298 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | MHS04 | 1380 | 24.536 | 1.186 | 3.4 | 1.3415 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | TO2 | 1380 | 24.536 | 1.136 | 2.0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | SURCHARGED |
| 1440 minute winter | TI2 | 1380 | 24.536 | 1.134 | 3.6 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | ОК |

| Link Event (Outflow) | US Node | Link | DS Node | Outflow (I/s) | Velocity (m/s) | Flow/Cap | Link Vol (m³) | Discharge Vol (m³) |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 360 minute winter | POW BECK 1 | 1.000 | POW BECK 2 | 1.7 | 0.754 | 0.001 | 0.0684 | |
| 360 minute winter | POW BECK 2 | 1.001 | POW BECK 3 | 2.2 | 0.899 | 0.002 | 0.0914 | 66.4 |
| 15 minute winter | MHS01 | 2.000 | TI1 | 71.4 | 4.056 | 2.764 | 0.0349 | |
| 360 minute winter | MHS02 | Hydro-Brake [®] | POW BECK 1 | 1.7 | | | | |
| 15 minute summer | TI1 | Flow through pond | TO1 | 42.9 | 0.128 | 0.099 | 28.7797 | |
| 15 minute summer | TO1 | 2.001 | MHS02 | 5.6 | 0.549 | 0.389 | 0.2132 | |
| 15 minute winter | MHS03 | 3.000 | TI2 | 57.5 | 3.266 | 2.892 | 0.0349 | |
| 1440 minute winter | MHS04 | Hydro-Brake [®] | POW BECK 2 | 0.5 | | | | |
| 30 minute winter | ТО2 | 3.001 | MHS04 | 4.5 | 0.669 | 0.160 | 0.0352 | |
| 15 minute winter | TI2 | Flow through pond | TO2 | 30.3 | 0.130 | 0.024 | 26.1245 | |

| R G PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD | CALCULATION | | Job No. | K38890 | Page | 1 of 8 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|--------|---------|------------|
| Meadowside | Job | Meadow Road | Drg no. | N/A | Date | 16/02/2022 |
| Shap Road | | Whitehaven | Revision | Orig | Initial | RH |
| KENDAL LA9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run-Off | | | Checked | CA |

DESIGN BASIS MEMORANDUM - PEAK RATE OF RUN-OFF CALCULATION

<u>Design Brief</u>

The following peak rate of run-off calculations have been undertaken to determine changes in peak flow resulting from the development of a greenfield or brownfield site. These calculations are for the **Peak Rate of Run-Off** requirements only.

Background Information & References

The site area **is less than** 200ha and the Greenfield (pre-development) calculation has been undertaken in accordance with methodology described by Marshall & Bayliss, Institute of Hydrology, Report No. 124, Flood Estimation for Small Catchments, 1994 (IoH 124).

In addition, the following references have been used in the preparation of these calculations:

- Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS), CIRIA, 2004
- CIRIA, The SUDS Manual, Report C753, 2015
- Designing for Exceedance in Urban Drainage good practice, CIRIA Report C635, 2006
- Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH)
- Flood Studies Report (FSR), Volume 1, Hydrological Studies, 1993
- Flood Studies Supplementary Report No 2 (FSSR2), The Estimation of Low Return Period Floods
- Flood Studies Supplementary Report No 14 (FSSR14), Review of Regional Growth Curves, 1983
- Planning Practice guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework, Recommended national precautionary sensitivity ranges for peak rainfall intensities, peak river flows, offshore wind speeds and wave heights.

Proposed Land Use Changes

Changes to the existing site are as follows:

Brownfield Site to Brownfield Site (Reduced Impermeable Area)

Results Summary

| Rate of Run-Off (I/s) | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Event | Greenfield | Post- Development | | | | | | |
| Q1 | 1.8 | 19.4 | 19.5 | | | | | |
| QBAR | 2.1 | 28.1 | 28.3 | | | | | |
| Q10 | 2.9 | 38.5 | 38.7 | | | | | |
| Q30 | 3.6 | 46.9 | 47.2 | | | | | |
| Q100 | 4.4 | 59.8 | 60.2 | | | | | |
| Q100 + 40% CC | 6.1 | 83.8 | 84.3 | | | | | |

| Shap Road | | Whitehaven | | Revision | Orig | Initial |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| KENDAL LA9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run-0 | Off | | | Checked |
| Existing Impermeable & Permeab | le Land Cov | ver | | | | |
| Total Site Area: Existing Impermeable & Permeab Land Cove | 0.3104 Ile Land Cov | ha <u>ver</u> Are | 3104 a | m² Percen | tage of to | otal site |
| Total Site Area: Existing Impermeable & Permeab Land Cove | 0.3104 Ne Land Cov | ha <u>ver</u> Are m² | 3104 a ha | m² Percen | tage of to area | otal site |
| Total Site Area: Existing Impermeable & Permeab Land Cove Total impermeabl | 0.3104 Ne Land Cov r | ha ver Are m² 2492 | 3104 a ha 0.249 | m² Percen | tage of to area 80% | otal site |

| Land Covor | Are | ea | Percentage of total site |
|------------------------------|------|-------|--------------------------|
| | m² | ha | area |
| Total housing roof area | 1287 | 0.129 | 41% |
| Total parking and paved area | 945 | 0.095 | 30% |
| Total road area | 275 | 0.027 | 9% |
| Garden & landscaped areas | 598 | 0.060 | 19% |

3104

100%

Proposed Impermeable & Permeable Land Cover

| Land Cover | Are | a | Percentage of total site |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|
| | m² ha | | area |
| Total impermeable area | 2506 | 0.251 | 81% |
| Remaining permeable area | 598 | 0.060 | 19% |

| R G PARKIN | NS & PARTNERS LTD | CALCULA | TION | | Job No. | K38890 | Page | 3 of 8 | |
|---|--|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Meadowside | 2 | Job | Meadow Roa | ad | Drg no. | N/A | Date | 16/02/2022 | |
| Shap Road | | | Whitehaven | | Revision | Orig | Initial | RH | |
| KENDAL L | A9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run- | -Off | | | Checked | CA | |
| <u>ESTIMATIO</u> | ESTIMATION OF QBAR (RURAL) (GREENFIELD RUNOFF RATE) | | | | | | | | |
| loH 124 base | IoH 124 based on research on small catchments < 25 km2 | | | | | | | | |
| Method is based on regression analysis of response times using catchments from 0.9 to 22.9 km ² | | | | | | | | | |
| QBAR _{rural} QBAR _{rural} | QBAR ruralis mean annual flood on rural catchmentQBAR ruraldepends on SOIL, SAAR and AREA most significantly | | | | | | | | |
| QBAR _{rural} | = | 0.00108 | x AREA ^{0.89} x | SAAR ^{1.17} x \$ | SOIL ^{2.17} | | | | |
| For SOIL ref | er to FSR Vol 1, Sectior | n 4.2.3 and | 4.2.6 and loł | H 124 | | | | | |
| Contributing Area, A | watershed area | = = = | 500000 0.500 50.000 | m² km² ha | insert 50 small cate | ha for EA chment m | ethod | | |
| SAAR | | = | 1120 | mm | From UK | Suds web | site (point | : data) | |
| Soil index ba | ased on soil type, SOIL | | = | = <u>(0.1S1+0.3</u> (S1+3 | <u>S2+0.37S</u> S2+S3+S4 | <u>3+0.47S4</u> 1+S5) | +0.53S5) | | |
| Where: | S1 S2 S3 S4 S5 | = = = = | 100 100 | % % % % | Value fro | m UK Su[| DS seems | reasonable | |
| So, | SOIL | = | 0.47 | | | | | | |
| Note: for ver | y small catchments it is | far better to | o rely on loca | l site investiç | ation info | rmation. | | | |
| QBAR _{rural} | | = = | 0.418 418.4 | m ³ /s l/s | | | | | |
| Small rural catchments less than 50 ha The Environment Agency recommends that this method should be used for development sizes from 0 to 50 ha and should linearly interpolate the formula to 50 ha. | | | | | | | | | |
| So, catchme | ent size | = = = | 2506 0.003 0.251 | m² km² ha | Excluding would ren positive d events. | g significa nain disco rainage s | nt open sp onnected f ystem dur | pace which rom the ing flood | |
| QBAR _{rural site} | | = = | 0.00210 2.10 | m ³ /s I/s | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| R G PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD | CALCULATION | | Job No. | K38890 | Page | 4 of 8 |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|--------|---------|------------|
| Meadowside | Job | Meadow Road | Drg no. | N/A | Date | 16/02/2022 |
| Shap Road | | Whitehaven | Revision | Orig | Initial | RH |
| KENDAL LA9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run-Off | | | Checked | CA |
| GREENFIELD RETURN PERIOD O | RDINATES | 3 | | | | |

QBAR can be factored by the UK FSR regional growth curves for return periods <2 years and for all other return periods to obtain peak flow estimates for required return periods.

These regional growth curves are constant throughout a region, whatever the catchment type and size.

See Table 2.39 for region curve ordinates Use FSSR2 Growth Curves to estimate Qbar Reference- Pg 173-FSR V.1, ch 2.6.2

Region

10

Use Figure A1.1 to determine region

GREENFIELD RETURN PERIOD FLOW RATES

| | Q (I/s) | Ordinate | Return Period |
|---------------------|---------|----------|---------------|
| Ordinate from FSSR2 | 1.82 | 0.87 | 1 |
| | 1.95 | 0.93 | 2 |
| | 2.50 | 1.19 | 5 |
| | 2.89 | 1.38 | 10 |
| 1 | 3.44 | 1.64 | 25 |
| | 3.57 | 1.7 | 30 |
| | 3.88 | 1.85 | 50 |
| | 4.36 | 2.08 | 100 |
| | 4.87 | 2.32 | 200 |
| | 5.73 | 2.73 | 500 |
| Interpola | 6.38 | 3.04 | 1000 |

Interpolation taken from Figure 24.2 (pg 515) SuDS Manual

| R G PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD | CALCULA | | Job No. | K38890 | Page | 5 of 8 |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Meadowside | Job | Meadow Road | Drg no. | N/A | Date | 16/02/2022 |
| Shap Road | | Whitehaven | Revision | Orig | Initial | RH |
| KENDAL LA9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run-Off | | | Checked | CA |
| ESTIMATE OF BROWNFIELD RUN Total site impermeable | NOFF e area, A = | 2492 m² | | | | |
| M5-60 rai Ratio M5-60/N | nfall depth /I5-2Day, r | 16 mm 0.27 | [Flood St [The Wal Modified (Hydrauli | iudies Rep llingford P Rational I ics Resea | oort (NER) roceedure Method, Fi rch, 1983) | C, 1975)] e - V4 ig A.2] |
| Storn | n Duration | 15 mins | Anticipate usually 1 | ed critical 5 minutes | duration f | or the site - |
| Duration | factor, Z1 | 0.58 | [The Wal Modified (Hvdrauli | llingford P Rational I ics Resea | roceedure Method, Fi rch. 1983) | e - V4 ig A.3b 11 |
| M5-15 rain | fall depth = | 9.3 mm | () | | , . , | |
| | Return pe M1-15 M10-15 M30-15 M100-15 | riod ratio, Z2 0.61 1.21 1.48 1.89 | [The Wal Modified (Hydrauli | llingford P Rational I ics Resea | roceedure Method, Ta rch, 1983) | e - V4 able A1]] |
| | | Rainfall | | | | |
| | M1-15 M10-15 M30-15 M100-15 | Depth Intensity (mm) (mm/hr 5.7 23 11.3 45 13.7 55 17.5 70 | , i) | | | |
| Peak discha | arge, Qp = | Cv Cr i A | | | | |
| Where: | Cv = Cr = i = | Volumetric Runoff Coe Routing Coefficient Rainfall intensity (mm/ł | fficient nour) | | | |
| | Cv = Cr = | 0.95 1.3 | | | | |
| | Peak Q1 Q10 Q30 Q100 | Runoff 19.4 38.5 46.9 59.8 | | | | |

| R G PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD | CALCULA | TION | Job No. | K38890 | Page | 6 of 8 |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Meadowside | Job | Meadow Road | Drg no. | N/A | Date | 16/02/2022 |
| Shap Road | | Whitehaven | Revision | Orig | Initial | RH |
| KENDAL LA9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run-Off | | | Checked | CA |
| ESTIMATION OF QBAR (BROWNF See Table 2.39 for region curve ordi | FIELD RUN | OFF RATE) | Reference | e- Pg 173 | -FSR V.1, | , ch 2.6.2 |
| Use FSSR2 Growth Curves to estim | ate Qbar | | | | | |
| | Region = | 10 | Use Figu | re A1.1 to | determine | e region |
| | Return Period 1 2 5 10 25 30 50 100 200 500 1000 | Ordinate 0.87 0.93 1.19 1.38 1.64 1.70 1.85 2.08 2.32 2.73 3.04 | Ordinate | from FSS tion taker 515) St | R2 n from Fig | ure 24.2 (pg al |
| Ord | (linate used 10 year 30 year 100 year | 2bar 1/s 27.9 27.6 28.8 28.09 I/s | Using the derived fr ordinates | average om three | Qbar | |

| R G PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD | CALCULA | | Job No. | K38890 | Page | 7 of 8 |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Meadowside | Job | Meadow Road | Drg no. | N/A | Date | 16/02/2022 |
| Shap Road | | Whitehaven | Revision | Orig | Initial | RH |
| KENDAL LA9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run-Off | | | Checked | CA |
| ESTIMATE OF BROWNFIELD RU | NOFF e area, A = | 2506 m ² | | | | |
| M5-60 rai Ratio M5-60/I | infall depth M5-2Day, r | 16 mm 0.27 | [Flood St [The Wal Modified (Hydrauli | udies Rep lingford P Rational I cs Resea | oort (NER) roceedure Method, Fi rch, 1983) | C, 1975)] 9 - V4 ig A.2] |
| Stor | m Duration | 15 mins | Anticipate usually 1 | ed critical 5 minutes | duration f | or the site - |
| Duratior | i factor, Z1 | 0.58 | [The Wal Modified (Hydrauli | lingford P Rational I cs Resea | roceedure Method, Fi rch. 1983) | e - V4 ig A.3b 1 |
| M5-15 rain | fall depth = | 9.3 mm | | | , ····/ | - |
| | Return pe M1-15 M10-15 M30-15 M100-15 | riod ratio, Z2 0.61 1.21 1.48 1.89 | [The Wal Modified (Hydrauli | lingford P Rational I cs Resea | roceedure Method, Ta rch, 1983) | e - V4 able A1] |
| | M1-15 M10-15 M30-15 M100-15 | Rainfall Depth Intensity (mm) (mm/h) 5.7 23 11.3 45 13.7 55 17.5 70 | /, i r) | | | |
| Peak disch | arge, Qp = | Cv Cr i A | | | | |
| Where: | Cv = Cr = i = | Volumetric Runoff Coo Routing Coefficient Rainfall intensity (mm/ | efficient 'hour) | | | |
| | Cv = Cr = | 0.95 1.3 | | | | |
| | Peal Q1 Q10 Q30 Q100 | Runoff 19.5 38.7 47.2 60.2 | | | | |

| R G PARKINS & PARTNERS LTD | CALCULA | TION | Job No. | K38890 | Page | 8 of 8 |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| Meadowside | Job | Meadow Road | Drg no. | N/A | Date | 16/02/2022 |
| Shap Road | | Whitehaven | Revision | Orig | Initial | RH |
| KENDAL LA9 6NY | Title | Rate of Run-Off | | | Checked | CA |
| ESTIMATION OF QBAR (BROWNF See Table 2.39 for region curve ordi | FIELD RUN | IOFF RATE) | Reference | <mark>e- Pa 17</mark> 3 | -FSR V.1 | ch 2.6.2 |
| Use FSSR2 Growth Curves to estim | ate Qbar | | | | | |
| | Region = | 10 | Use Figu | re A1.1 to | determine | e region |
| | Return Period 1 2 5 10 25 30 50 100 200 500 1000 | Ordinate 0.87 0.93 1.19 1.38 1.64 1.70 1.85 2.08 2.32 2.73 3.04 | Ordinate | from FSS ation taker 515) Su | R2 n from Fig iDS Manu | ure 24.2 (pg al |
| Ord Proposed Brownfield Runo | ff, Qbar = | I/s 28.1 27.7 28.9 28.25 I/s | Using the derived from ordinates | e average om three | Qbar | |

| | SuDS S |
|--|--------|
| 97 King Street Lancaster LA1 1RH | |
| Tel:01524 32548 | M |
| Email: office@rgparkinslancaster.co.uk | IV |

| | Job Number | Page Number | |
|-------------------|------------|---------------|--|
| SuDS Simple Index | К38890 | 1 of 3 | |
| Approach | Calc by | Check by | |
| | RH | OS | |
| Meadow Road | Date | Revised | |
| Whitehaven | 27/01/2022 | OS 12/05/2022 | |

DESIGN BASIS MEMORANDUM - SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE TREATMENT OF SURFACE WATER

Design Brief

The following calculations outline the recommended treatment requirements for a sustaionable drainage system as outlined in the SuDS Manual 2015. The method used is the simple index approach outlined in section 26. The requirement for oil interceptors has been assessed in line with the now withdrawn Pollution Prevention Guidance document PPG3, produced by the Environment Agency. An oil interceptor is not required for the proposed development.

Treatment within SuDS components is affected by the flow rate and volume of water which passes through the component. It is not reasonable or practical to treat the entirety of the runoff for infrequent greater intensity design storms. In any case the majority of the pollutants are removed from surfaces by the more frequent rainfall events and in the first flush resulting from the initial runoff from the larger events. and to a certain capacity.

The following references have been used in the preparation of these calculations:

- SUDS Manual, CIRIA Report C753, 2015
- Pollution Mitigation Indicies provided by Hydro International

Results Summary

Residential Parking:

Treatment component 1 Pervious pavement underlain by 300 mm minimum depth of soils with good contamination attenuation potential

Treatment component 2 None

| Indices | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydrocarbon |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------|-------------|
| Pollution Hazard | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Pollution Mitigation | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Treatment Suitability | Adequate | Adequate | Adequate |

Residential Roads

Treatment component 1 Pervious pavement (where the pavement is not designed as an infiltration component)

Treatment component 2 None

| Indices | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydrocarbon |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------|-------------|
| Pollution Hazard | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Pollution Mitigation | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Treatment Suitability | Adequate | Adequate | Adequate |

| | | Job Number | Page Number |
|--|----------------------------|------------|---------------|
| | SuDS Simple Index Approach | K38890 | 2 of 3 |
| K G PAKK NS | Subs Simple Index Approach | Calc by | Check by |
| 97 King Street Japraster JA1 18H | | RH | OS |
| Tel:01524 32548 | Meadow Road | Date | Revised |
| Email: office@rgparkinslancaster.co.uk | Whitehaven | 27/01/2022 | OS 12/05/2022 |
| | | | |

POLLUTION HAZARD INDEX

| | Pollutio | n Hazard In | dices | |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------|-------------------|
| Source of Runoff | Pollution Hazard | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydro- carbons |
| Residential parking | Low | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |

POLLUTION MITIGATION INDEX

The receiving water body shall be: Surface Water

| | | Pollution Mitigation Indices | | ndices |
|---|--|------------------------------|--------|-------------------|
| | SuDS Component | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydro- carbons |
| 1 | Pervious pavement underlain by 300 mm minimum depth of soils with good contamination attenuation potential | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| 2 | None | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | None | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | None | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Pollution Mitigation Index 0.7 0.6

0.7

ASSESSMENT OF TREATMENT PROPOSAL

| Indices | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydro-carbons |
|----------------------|------------------|----------|---------------|
| Pollution Hazard | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Pollution Mitigation | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| | Adequate | Adequate | Adequate |

| R G PARKINS 97 King Street Lancaster LA1 1RH Tel:01524 32548 Email: office/0rmarkinslancaster on uk | SuDS Simple Index Approach | | Job Number K388 Calc by RH Date | 90 | Page Number 3 of 3 Check by OS Revised | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|---------------|
| POLLUTION HAZARD INDEX | | Whitehaven Pollution | Hazard Ind | 27/01/2 lices | 2022 | OS 12/05/2022 |
| Source of Runoff | Pollution Hazard | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydro- carbons | | |
| Low traffic roads (e.g. residential roads and general access roads, < 300 traffic movements/day) | Low | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | | |
| POLLUTION MITIGATION INDEX The receiving water body shall be: | Surface Water | | | | | |
| SuDS Component | | Pollution N Suspended Solids | Aitigation Ir Metals | Hydro- carbons | | |

| | | | | carbons |
|---|---|-----|-----|---------|
| 1 | Pervious pavement (where the pavement is not designed as an infiltration component) | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| 2 | None | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | None | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | None | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Total Pollution Mitigation Index 0.7 0.6 0.7

ASSESSMENT OF TREATMENT PROPOSAL

| Indices | Suspended Solids | Metals | Hydro-carbons |
|----------------------|------------------|----------|---------------|
| Pollution Hazard | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Pollution Mitigation | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| | Adequate | Adequate | Adequate |